

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

JOSÉ ROBLES

HAZELTON SPENCER

---

VOLUME XLIX

1934

---

BALTIMORE  
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1934





# TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLIX

	PAGE
Anibal, C. E., Lope de Vega and the Duque de Osuna.....	1
Morley, S. G., Lope de Vega's <i>Peregrino</i> Lists Not <i>Termini a Quo</i> ....	11
Wade, G. E., Tirso's <i>Santa Juana, Primera Parte</i> .....	13
Wright, L. O., Final <i>S</i> Plus <i>N</i> -Glide in Mexico.....	18
Fucilla, J. G., Glosses on <i>El Bernardo</i> of Bernardo de Balbuena.....	20
Hespelt, E. H. and Williams, S. T., Two Unpublished Anecdotes by Fernán Caballero Preserved by Washington Irving.....	25
Rael, J. B., <i>Cosa Nada</i> en el Español Nuevomejicano.....	31
Ham, Edward B., Paire d'Armes.....	32
Roesch, Lydia, <i>Immensee</i> und Kein Ende.....	34
Gohdes, Clarence, Getting Ready for Brook Farm.....	36
Howe, M. L., A Dramatic Skit by Dante Gabriel Rossetti.....	39
Jones, F. L., <i>Paradise Lost</i> , I, 549-62.....	44
Parsons, E. S., Milton's Seasonal Inspiration.....	46
Harris, Brice, "Letter to C—— W.".....	46
Hinckley, H. B., The Framing Tale.....	69
Hankins, J. E., Chaucer and the <i>Pervigilium Veneris</i> .....	80
Slaughter, E. E., "Allas! Allas! That Ever Love was Sinne!.....	83
Kaut, Thelma, Chaucer's Age and the Prologues to the Legend.....	87
Garvin, Katherine, A Note on Noah's Wife.....	88
Bowers, R. H., Lydgate's "The Churl and the Bird," MS. Harley 2407, and Elias Ashmole.....	90
Hammer, Jacob, Note on Geoffrey of Monmouth's <i>Historia Regum Britanniae</i> VI. 12 and VI. 15.....	94
Ward, Henshaw, Should There be Any Plurals in <i>oes</i> ?.....	95
Kuethe, J. L., <i>Stir</i> and <i>Chive</i> .....	98
Allen, D. C., Early Eighteenth-Century Literary Relations Between England and Germany.....	99
Arndt, K. J., Poe's <i>Politian</i> and Goethe's <i>Mignon</i> .....	101
MacGillivray, J. R., The Date of Composition of <i>The Borderers</i> .....	104
Ainsworth, E. G., Jr., Another Source of the "Lonesome Road" Stanza in <i>The Ancient Mariner</i> .....	111
Harrison, T. P., Jr., Spenser, Ronsard, and Bion.....	139
Baroway, Israel, Tremellius, Sidney, and Biblical Verse.....	145
Will, S. F., An Unpublished Letter of Du Bartas.....	150
Baudin, Maurice, The Shifting of Responsibility in XVIIth Century French Tragic Drama.....	152
Nethercot, A. H., Milton, Jonson, and the Young Cowley.....	158
Godolphin, F. R. B., Milton, <i>Lycidas</i> and Propertius, <i>Elegies</i> , III, 7..	162
Whiting, G. W., Milton's Rules for <i>ED</i> .....	166
Scott-Thomas, H. F., The Date of Nahum Tate's Death.....	169
Stein, Harold, Goldsmith's Translation of the <i>Roman Comique</i> .....	171

	PAGE
Anderson, P. B., English Drama Transferred to Prévost's Fiction....	178
Crowley, F. J., Two Unpublished Letters of Voltaire.....	181
Prahl, A. J., Seitenlichter auf den Charakter Gerstäckers.....	182
Manly, John M., Chaucer's Mission to Lombardy.....	209
Brown, Carleton, The Squire and the Number of the Canterbury Pilgrims .....	216
Myers, Louis McCorry, A Line in the Reeve's Prologue.....	222
Moses, W. R., An Appetite for Form.....	226
Schlauch, Margaret, Chaucer's Merchant's Tale and a Russian Legend of King Solomon.....	229
Savage, Henry L, A Note on <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> 2035.	232
Thomson, S. Harrison, A XIIIth Century <i>Oure Fader</i> in a Pavia MS.	235
Gerould, Gordon Hall, Thunor in Kent.....	238
Shanks, Elsie, Anglo-Norman <i>Suite Work</i> (?).....	239
Lancaster, H. Carrington, The Beginnings of French Uvular R.....	243
Koenig, Vernon Frederic, Jean Renart and the Authorship of <i>Galeran de Bretagne</i> .....	248
Krappe, Alexander Haggerty, The Date of <i>Oipéris de Vigneaux</i> ....	255
Ewen, Frederic, John Gibson Lockhart, Propagandist of German Literature .....	260
Bestor, Arthur Eugene, Jr., Emerson's Adaptation of a Line from Spenser .....	265
Bush, Douglas, The Date of Keats's <i>Fall of Hyperion</i> .....	281
Parsons, C. O., The Highland Feasts of Fergus MacIvor and Lord Lovat .....	287
Howe, M. L., Dante Gabriel Rossetti's Comments on <i>Maud</i> .....	290
Feise, Ernst, Problems of Lyric Form.....	293
Hatfield, J. T., To an <i>Albumblatt</i> of Uhland.....	301
Prahl, A. J., Gerstäcker über zeitgenössische Schriftsteller.....	302
Howard, Leon, A Predecessor of <i>Moby-Dick</i> .....	310
Averill, E. C., An Undiscovered Bit of Verse by Longfellow.....	311
Austin, H. D., Dante Notes.....	312
Henning, G. N., <i>Le Sacrifice</i> of Leconte de Lisle.....	316
Herring, Margaret, Un Résumé de quelques années de la vie de Buffon. Lettre inédite.....	317
Beall, C. B., Guez de Balzac and Tasso.....	320
Ham, R. G., Dryden and the Colleges.....	324
Day, C. L., A Lost Play by D'Urfey.....	332
Norris, E. T., A Possible Origin of Congreve's Sailor Ben.....	334
Bédé, Jean-Albert, Chateaubriand and Marcel Proust.....	353
Seeber, Edward D., Parny as an Opponent of Slavery.....	360
Edwards, Bateman, An Unpublished Fragment of Gui de Cambrai's <i>Vengement Alixandre</i> .....	366
Paul, Henry N., Players' Quartos and Duodecimos of <i>Hamlet</i> .....	369
Parrott, Thomas Marc, Errors and Omissions in the Griggs Facsimile of the Second Quarto of <i>Hamlet</i> .....	376
Cain, H. Edward, Marlowe's "French Crowns".....	380

# CONTENTS

	V
	PAGE
Allen, Don Cameron, A Source for <i>Cambises</i> .....	384
Neill, Kerby, Spenser's <i>Shamefastnesse, Faerie Queene</i> , II, ix, 40-44..	387
McManaway, James G., "Occasion," <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II. iv. 4-5.....	391
Faust, George P., A Spenser Parallel.....	393
Brown, Carleton, Sermons and Miracle Plays.....	394
Ackerman, Robert W., Tester: <i>Knight's Tale</i> , 2499.....	397
Massey, B. W. A., The Division of Words.....	400
Williams, Ronald B., An Omission From Curme's <i>Syntax</i> .....	404
Aubin, Robert A., A Note on Eighteenth-Century Progress Pieces....	405
Avery, Emmett L., An Early Performance of Fielding's <i>Historical Register</i> .....	407
Stoll, Elmer Edgar, The <i>Beau Monde</i> at the Restoration.....	425
Niemeyer, Carl, The Earl of Roscommon's Academy.....	432
Paul, Henry N., Mr. Hughs' Edition of <i>Hamlet</i> .....	438
Bradner, Leicester, An Allusion to Bromley in the <i>Shepherd's Calendar</i> .....	443
Hayes, Albert McHarg, Wyatt's Letters to his Son.....	446
Morrison, Morris Robert, Greene's Use of Aristo in <i>Orlando Furioso</i>	449
Allen, Don Cameron, Neptune's <i>Agar</i> in Lyly's <i>Galathea</i> .....	451
Gerhardt, Erma R., Ben Jonson's Appreciation of Chaucer as Evi- denced in <i>The English Grammar</i> .....	452
Campbell, Lily B., The Lost Play of <i>Æsop's Crow</i> .....	454
Salter, F. M., An Un-Noticed Acrostic and an Inglorious Poet.....	457
Brooks, Cleanth, Chaucer: <i>Saturn's Daughter</i> .....	459
Severs, J. Burke, The Job Passage in the <i>Clerkes Tale</i> .....	461
Smith, John Harrington, Gawain's Leap: <i>G. G. K.</i> I. 2316.....	462
Foulet, Alfred, Joinville et le conseil tenu à Acre en 1250.....	464
Price, E. H., An Error in Dating a Letter of Montesquieu.....	468
Holbrook, Wm. C., Voltaire and Blin de Sainmore: an Unpublished Voltaire Letter.....	470
Zucker, A. E. and Henderson, P. de F., <i>Camille</i> as the Translation of <i>La Dame aux camélias</i> .....	472
Thorpe, Clarence D., Thomas Hanmer and the Anonymous Essay on <i>Hamlet</i> .....	493
Rollins, Hyder E., An Elizabethan Ballad of Malmerophus and Sillera	498
Buckley, George T., Who was "The Late Arrian"?.....	500
Sharp, Robert Lathrop, The Pejorative Use of <i>Metaphysical</i> .....	503
Kelley, Maurice, Milton, Ibn Ezra, and Wollebius.....	506
Aubin, Robert A., Some Eighteenth-Century Sonnets.....	507
Bronson, Bertrand H., James Robertson, Poet and Playwright.....	509
Bald, R. C., A New Letter from Charles Lamb.....	511
Palfrey, Thomas R., Balzac in England.....	513
Fess, G. M., Balzac's First Thought of <i>César Bروتтеau</i> .....	516
Merton, Sibley, A Letter from Lamartine to "Gr. K.".....	519
Seeber, Edward D., <i>Humanisme, Humanitisme and Humanitarisme</i> ..	521
Pollard, E. A., <i>Ferwazzot</i> .....	523
Bernbaum, Ernest, Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800.....	523

	REVIEWS	PAGE
E. Neff, Carlyle; P. Meissner, Samuel Butler der Jüngere. [W. H. Dunn.]		47
H. Spencer (ed.), Elizabethan Plays. [T. M. Parrott.]		50
Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan, Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature. [A. H. Gilbert.]		51
J. H. Scott and Z. E. Chandler, Phrasal Patterns in English Prose. [M. W. Croll.]		53
C. P. Smith, Pattern and Variation in Poetry. [M. W. Croll.]		54
L. M. Wright, The Literary Life of the Early Friends, 1650-1725; Literature and Education in Early Quakerism. [E. K. Maxfield.]		55
H. Schöffler, Die Anfänge des Puritanismus. [H. R. Patch.]		57
W. Fleming, Der Wandel des deutschen Naturgefühls vom 15. zum 18. Jahrhundert. [E. Feise.]		58
W. Dilthey, Von deutscher Dichtung und Musik. [E. Feise.]		60
W. Kayser, Die Klangmalerei bei Harsdörffer. [E. Feise.]		61
J. Hankiss (ed.), Théophile de Viau: Pyrame et Thisbé. [H. C. Lancaster.]		63
F. C. Tarr and A. Centeno, A Graded Spanish Review Grammar. [J. Robles.]		64
Karl Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church. [Grace Frank.]		112
Johannes Hoops, Kommentar zum Beowulf. [P. F. Jones.]		115
Margarete Willinsky, Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes. [S. B. Hustedt.]		116
B. T. Spencer (ed.), The Bondman, by Philip Massinger; Ursula Todd-Naylor (ed.), The Country Wife, by William Wycherley. [J. G. McManaway.]		118
N. W. Sawyer, The Comedy of Manners from Sheridan to Maugham; R. H. Ware, American Adaptations of French Plays on the New York and Philadelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War; M. S. Peterson, Robert Jephson (1736-1803). [E. B. Watson.]		120
Emil Ermatinger, Philosophie der Literaturwissenschaft. [E. Feise.]		123
F. B. Snyder, The Life of Robert Burns. [W. A. Neilson.]		127
C. M. Newlin, The Life and Writings of H. H. Brackenridge. [W. S. Holt.]		128
Randall Stewart (ed.), The American Notebooks of Nathaniel Hawthorne. [C. J. Weber.]		130
H. F. Lowry (ed.), The Letters of Matthew Arnold to A. H. Clough. [E. Neff.]		131
G. L. Bickersteth (trans.), The Paradiso of Dante Alighieri. [L. Lockert.]		133
J. K. Ditchy (ed.), Les Acadiens Louisianais et Leur Parler. [E. L. Tinker.]		188
E. L. Tinker, Les Ecrits de langue française en Louisiane au XIX <sup>e</sup> siècle; Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana; The Palingenesis of Craps. [J. K. Ditchy.]		190
D. S. Rankin, Kate Chopin and her Creole Stories. [F. Hard.]		192

# CONTENTS

vii  
PAGE

C. F. Brooke and N. B. Paradise (eds.), English Drama, 1580-1642. [ <i>B. Maxwell.</i> ]	193
John Sellards, Dans le Sillage du Romantisme. Charles Didier (1805-1864). [ <i>B. M. Woodbridge.</i> ]	195
Raymond Las Vergnas, Le Chevalier Rutledge, "Gentilhomme Anglais," 1742-1794. [ <i>R. W. Babcock.</i> ]	196
Anton Weber, George Gising und die Soziale Frage; Raymond Las Vergnas, W. M. Thackeray. [ <i>J. W. Beach.</i> ]	200
Frieda Vogt, Thomas Hardys Naturansicht in seinen Romanen. [ <i>E. B. Burgum.</i> ]	202
M. E. Pascoe, Les Drame religieux du milieu du XVII <sup>e</sup> siècle, 1636-1650. [ <i>H. C. Lancaster.</i> ]	204
Maurice Magendie, Le Roman français au XVII <sup>e</sup> siècle, de l' <i>Astrée</i> au <i>Grand Cyrus</i> ; D. F. Dallas, Le Roman français de 1660 à 1680. [ <i>H. C. Lancaster.</i> ]	206
Wilhelm Havers, Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax. [ <i>F. H. Wilkens.</i> ]	267
Pierre Trahard, Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle (1715-1789). [ <i>G. R. Havens.</i> ]	268
Henri Peyre, Louis Ménard (1822-1901). [ <i>E. Malakis.</i> ]	270
Henri Peyre, Qu'est-ce que le Classicisme? [ <i>Horatio Smith.</i> ]	271
Eugen Schnell, Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole "Incendium Amoris" und "Emendatio Vitae" und deren Übersetzung durch Richard Misyn. [ <i>B. J. Whiting.</i> ]	272
Sister Mary of the Incarnation Byrne, The Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England. [ <i>H. R. Patch.</i> ]	274
Curt Ferdinand Bühler, The Sources of the Court of Sapience. [ <i>J. B. Collins.</i> ]	275
A. Allen Brockington, Browning and the Twentieth Century. [ <i>E. B. Burgum.</i> ]	276
Edwin Chappell, Shorthand Letters of Samuel Pepys. [ <i>Rudolf Kirk.</i> ]	278
Ernst Cassirer, Die Philosophie der Aufklärung. [ <i>F. W. Kaufmann.</i> ]	336
Marianne Beyer-Fröhlich (ed.), Deutsche Literatur. Deutsche Selbstzeugnisse: Aus dem Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation. [ <i>F. W. Kaufmann.</i> ]	337
Friedrich Vogt und Max Koch, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. [ <i>E. Feise.</i> ]	338
Ruth Clark, Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal. [ <i>N. L. Torrey.</i> ]	339
R. P. Bond, English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750. [ <i>Brice Harris.</i> ]	340
Rae Blanchard (ed.), The Christian Hero, by Richard Steele. [ <i>R. H. Griffith.</i> ]	342
F. E. Budd (ed.), The Works of William Burnaby. [ <i>Hazelton Spencer.</i> ]	343
Bliss Perry, Emerson Today. [ <i>Hazelton Spencer.</i> ]	345
E. M. Wright, The Life of Joseph Wright. [ <i>Kemp Malone.</i> ]	346
R. W. Chambers, Max Förster und Robin Flower (eds.) The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry. [ <i>Kemp Malone.</i> ]	347
H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, The Growth of Literature. I. The Ancient Literatures of Europe. [ <i>Kemp Malone.</i> ]	348

	PAGE
A. Pillet und H. Carstens, Bibliographie des Troubadours. [W. P. Shepard.]	408
J. A. Balseiro, Novelistas españoles modernos. [José Robles.]	410
N. Van Wijngaarden, Les Odyssées philosophiques en France entre 1616 et 1789; F. Lachèvre, Le Royaume d'Antangil. [G. Chinard.]	413
C. B. Lewis, Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance. [H. R. Patch.]	415
W. B. Gates, The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William Lower. [K. M. Lynch.]	418
H. J. Weigand, Thomas Mann's Novel <i>Der Zauberberg</i> . [A. E. Zucker.]	419
R. W. Chambers, On the Continuity of English Prose. [F. P. Magoun, Jr.]	477
Stefan Hofer, Geschichte der mittelfranzösischen Literatur. [Edward B. Ham.]	481
Marion F. Chevalier, A Dramatic Adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century: Les Aventures et le Mariage de Panurge by Pousset de Montauban. [C. D. Zdanowicz.]	483
Charles Gould (ed.), B. L. de Muralt, Lettres sur les Anglois et les François. [Albert Schinz.]	485
C. J. Sisson, Mark Eccles, Deborah Jones, Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans. [R. C. Bald.]	486
Hermann Anders, Die Bedeutung Wordworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats. [E. J. Morley.]	488
P. K. Guha, Tragic Relief; Alan Griffith Chester, Thomas May; B. S. Bruestle, The "Fool of Nature" in the English Drama of our Day. [D. C. Allen.]	489
R. B. Roulston (ed.), Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: Huttens letzte Tage. [A. W. Porterfield.]	535
E. E. Ericson, The Use of <i>Swa</i> in Old English. [G. W. Small.]	537
S. W. Holsboer, l'Histoire de la mise en scène dans le théâtre français de 1600 à 1657; K. Loukovitch, l'Evolution de la tragédie religieuse classique en France. [H. O. Lancaster.]	539
B. M. Woodbridge, le Roman belge contemporain. [G. B. Fundenburg.]	542
R. Levy, Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive. [U. T. Holmes.]	543
C. W. Lemmi, The Classic Deities in Bacon. [Douglas Bush.]	544
H. Spencer (ed.), The Tragedy of King Richard III. [O. J. Campbell.]	546
A. Ralli, A History of Shakespearian Criticism. [H. Spencer.]	548
W. Keller, Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. [T. W. Baldwin.]	549

## BRIEF MENTION

	PAGE
Jean Pommier, La Mystique de Baudelaire. [L. P. Shanks.]	65
E. Sulger-Gebing, Gerhart Hauptmann. [E. Feise.]	65
Eva Walraf, Soziale Lyrik in England 1880-1914. [G. H. Harper.]	66
H. Ammon, Dämon Faust. [A. E. Zucker.]	66

# CONTENTS

ix

PAGE

K. Jäckel, Richard Wagner in der französischen Literatur. [A. E. Zucker.] .....	67
Anna Jacobson, Nachklänge Richard Wagners im Roman. [A. E. Zucker.] .....	67
J. Boyd, Goethe's Knowledge of English Literature. [A. E. Zucker.] .....	67
F. Shove, Christina Rossetti, a Study. [E. B. Burgum.] .....	68
F. P. Hett. (ed.), The Memoirs of Sir Robert Sibbald. [E. N. Hooker.] .....	134
Leota S. Willis, Francis Lenton, Queen's Poet. [E. A. Strathmann.] .....	135
H. E. Rollins (ed.), <i>A Poetical Rhapsody</i> , 1602-1621. [D. Bush.] .....	136
R. M. Alden and O. J. Campbell, A Shakespeare Handbook. [M. A. Shaaber.] .....	136
E. L'Hommedé, Le secret de Shakespeare, Les Sonnets. [M. A. Shaaber.] .....	136
R. C. Bald (ed.), Literary Friendships in the Age of Wordsworth. [R. D. Havens.] .....	137
R. P. Sechler, George Moore: "A Disciple of Walter Pater." [E. N. Hooker.] .....	137
S. B. Liljegren, Harrington and the Jews. [M. A. Shaaber.] .....	137
J. E. Wells, Fifth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English. [K. Malone.] .....	138
Members of the Chaucer Course in Bowdoin College (eds.), <i>The Pearl</i> . [K. Malone.] .....	138
S. P. Chase, <i>The Pearl</i> , rendered in Modern Verse. [K. Malone.] .....	138
H. M. Ayres, <i>Beowulf</i> , a paraphrase. [K. Malone.] .....	208
E. P. Dargan, Honoré de Balzac. A Force of Nature. [G. Chinard.] .....	279
W. F. Falls, Buffon et l'Agrandissement du Jardin du Roi à Paris. [G. Chinard.] .....	279
E. Gillet, Maria Jane Jewsbury. [G. H. Harper.] .....	280
Dorothy L. Werner, The Idea of Union in American Verse (1776-1876). [L. Howard.] .....	349
Jacqueline de la Harpe, <i>Le Journal des Savants</i> et la Renommée de Pope en France au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle. [L. I. Bredvold.] .....	350
C. L. Day (ed.), The Songs of John Dryden. [L. I. Bredvold.] .....	350
H. J. Reesink, L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les Trois Plus Anciens Périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709. [L. I. Bredvold.] .....	350
Ch.-M. des Granges et O. Towles, Histoire de la Civilisation française des origines à nos jours. [H. C. Lancaster.] .....	351
E. Partridge, Literary Sessions. [T. M. Raysor.] .....	351
J. C. Ghosh (ed.), The Works of Thomas Otway: Plays, Poems, and Love-Letters. [H. Spencer.] .....	351
A. H. Heusinkveld and E. J. Bashe, A Bibliographical Guide to Old English. [K. Malone.] .....	352
M. Förster (ed.), Die Vercelli-Homilien. [K. Malone.] .....	352
G. P. Krapp (ed.), The Vercelli Book; The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius. [K. Malone.] .....	352

	PAGE
F. Baldensperger, Alfred de Vigny, Contribution à sa Biographie Intellectuelle. [ <i>G. Chinard.</i> ].....	421
Marie L. Goudard, Etude sur les <i>Epistres Morales</i> d'Honoré d'Urfé. [ <i>H. C. Lancaster.</i> ].....	421
J. J. Hof, Friesche Dialectgeographie. [ <i>E. H. Sehrt.</i> ].....	422
J. E. Ross, The Social Criticism of Fenimore Cooper. [ <i>R. E. Spiller.</i> ].....	422
L. Abercrombie and others, Aspects of Shakespeare: Being British Academy Lectures. [ <i>H. Spencer.</i> ].....	423
R. D. James, Old Drury of Philadelphia. [ <i>N. B. Fagin.</i> ].....	491
T. C. Pollock, The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century. [ <i>N. B. Fagin.</i> ].....	491
M. O. Zwick, Berthold Auerbachs sozialpolitischer und ethischer Liberalismus. [ <i>A. E. Zucker.</i> ].....	492
G. Vinant, Malwida de Meysenbug, sa vie et ses amis. [ <i>A. E. Zucker.</i> ].....	492
<i>ELH.</i> [ <i>R. D. Havens.</i> ].....	551
T. J. Wise and T. L. Hood (eds.), Letters of Robert Browning. [ <i>F. L. Lucas.</i> ].....	552
Gertrude M. Sibley, The Lost Plays and Masques 1500-1642. [ <i>T. W. Baldwin.</i> ].....	552
Johanne M. Stochholm (ed.), Massinger, <i>The Great Duke of Florence.</i> [ <i>J. G. McManaway.</i> ].....	553
R. S. Telfer (ed.), Massinger, <i>The Unnatural Combat.</i> [ <i>J. G. McManaway.</i> ].....	553
K. Campbell, The Mind of Poe and Other Studies. [ <i>J. O. French.</i> ].....	554
G. A. Plimpton, The Education of Shakespeare. [ <i>H. Spencer.</i> ].....	555
J.-L. Perrier (ed.), <i>Les Enfances Guillaume</i> , Chanson de geste du XII <sup>e</sup> siècle. [ <i>Grace Frank.</i> ].....	555
Ada Goldberg and H. Saye, An Index to medieval French medical receipts. [ <i>G. Moody.</i> ].....	556
J. A. MacCulloch, Medieval Faith and Fable. [ <i>K. Malone.</i> ].....	556
T. R. Brenton, An Essay on Poetics. [ <i>M. W. Croll.</i> ].....	557
E. Guyot, John Galsworthy: le Romancier. [ <i>A. E. Dubois.</i> ].....	557
M. Sommerfeld (ed.), Judith Dramen des 16.-17. Jahrhunderts, nebst Luthers Vorrede zum Buch Judith. [ <i>A. E. Zucker.</i> ].....	558
P. Engel, Der dramatische Vortrieb in Goethe's "Torquato Tasso." [ <i>A. E. Zucker.</i> ].....	558
F. A. Patterson (ed.), The Student's Milton. [ <i>R. D. Havens.</i> ].....	558
E. de Selincourt (ed.), <i>The Prelude</i> (Text of 1805). [ <i>R. D. Havens.</i> ].....	559

## CORRESPONDENCE

Dickson, A., Valentine and Orson.....	68
Averill, Esther C., Longfellow "Undiscovered".....	423
Steiner, A., The Date of Composition of <i>Cyperis de Vigneaux</i> .....	559
Gates, W. P., Poe's <i>Politian</i> Again.....	561
Schaffer, A., Eugène Manuel, Uhland, and Sir William Jones.....	562

## NECROLOGY

David S. Blondheim.....	424
-------------------------	-----



# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume XLIX

January, 1934

Number 1

---

---

## LOPE DE VEGA AND THE DUQUE DE OSUNA

One of the points raised by José F. Montesinos<sup>1</sup> in expressing his doubts regarding the paternity of *Guerras de amor y de honor*, published in Tomo VI of the Academy's *Nueva edición* of Lope de Vega's *Obras dramáticas* as of unquestionable authenticity, concerns Lope's relations with don Pedro Téllez Girón, the Third and "Great" Duque de Osuna. Disregarding, for the moment, other elements that make the general question of *Guerras'* authenticity too complicated for consideration at this time, the present note seeks to demonstrate only that at the probable date of *Guerras'* composition, Lope might well have been interested in paying the Duque de Osuna a compliment. The date of the play is set by Cotarelo<sup>2</sup> as about 1610, by Montesinos as between 1610 and 1616, and by W. L. Fichter,<sup>3</sup> on the excellent grounds of possible allusion to doña Marta de Nevaes, as between 1610 and 1619 and perhaps even within a shorter bracket, 1616-1619.

Montesinos, who strangely fails to recognize in the flattering treatment of the protagonist, a forbear of the Casa de Córdoba, the constantly obvious<sup>4</sup> genealogical compliment to Lope's most faithful patron, the Duque de Sessa, Luis Fernández de Córdoba, feels that "es bastante improbable que un poeta escriba una comedia para alabar a un magnate y luego alabe a otro; que si el autor era protegido de alguien, éste no era el Duque de Sessa, sino el de Osuna, el único que se cita nominalmente en un elogio en globo de la Nobleza"; and adds in a note: "Si hubiera que decidirse por

<sup>1</sup> *RFE.*, VII (1930), 49.

<sup>2</sup> *Nueva edición*, VI, xiii.

<sup>3</sup> In another review of the including volume, *RR.*, XXII (1931), 48-9.

<sup>4</sup> *Nueva ed.*, VI, 141b, 150b, 153b, 155a, 157a, 160, 163b, 165b, 166, 168b, 169a, 170a.

algún candidato conocido, nosotros nos inclinaríamos a indicar el nombre de Mira, *tal vez más interesado que Lope en alabar al de Osuna.*"

But *Guerras'* single allusion to the Duque de Osuna is not only out of all proportion to the predominant mass of material glorifying the House of Córdoba, but is accompanied by honorable mention of both the latter and two other great houses:

Luego en retratos, señor,  
vi por la espada y la lanza  
Vegas, Córdoba, Mendozas  
dar gloria y nombre a sus casas,  
y entre ellos un mozo ilustre,  
maestre de Calatrava,  
Girón en nombre, que a Osuna  
dió inmortales alabanzas.<sup>5</sup>

Lope knew that splendid competition did not detract from a noble's glory but enhanced it, and indeed was too familiar with the Chronicles—and the *romances*—to have omitted from any catalogue of Grenadine heroes the great name of Girón.<sup>6</sup> That he did not limit his compliments to any one noble family is too well known to require proof. But it might be noted that allusion to the Duque de Sessa, and even such marked insistence on his patronage as is found throughout *Los ramilletes de Madrid* (Nov. or Dec., 1615), by no means restrains Lope from eulogizing other *magnates* in the same *comedia*;<sup>7</sup> that, in fact, Lope's attentions to other nobles seem to have been carried so far as even to have inspired the Duque de Sessa with a certain jealousy.<sup>8</sup>

That the passage quoted above does, however, pay particular

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 167b.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *El remedio en la desdicha*, composed before 1604 but probably retouched before publication in *Parte XIII*, 1620, vv. 306-310 (*Clás. Cast.* 39), where despite the length of the list, Lope fails to mention the Córdoba.

<sup>7</sup> In *Los ramilletes de Madrid*, Lope not only eulogizes the Duque de Osuna (*BAE.*, LII, 321b) but pays especial compliments to Lerma (pp. 313c, 317b) and Uceda (321b).

<sup>8</sup> In a letter to Sessa, perhaps somewhat earlier than the date set by La Barrera (beginning of 1618?), Lope protests: "Yo no tengo más de un señor, ni en mi vida tuve más de un amigo: no me diga V. ex<sup>a</sup>. esos disfavores" (*Nueva biografía*, p. 285).

honor to don Rodrigo Téllez Girón, the Duque de Osuna's most admirable ancestor, is quite obvious. But this is by no means evidence that, as Montesinos suggests, the author of this tribute may not have been Lope. To the contrary, the young Grand Master of Calatrava was to Lope *per se* an especially attractive and sympathetic figure.

Lope's continued interest in this colorful personage is best evidenced by the fact that he makes him the protagonist of the secondary (attack on Ciudad Real) plot of *Fuente Ovejuna*, and that previously he had included him in a sort of Hall of Fame in *La Arcadia*<sup>9</sup> as worthy company for 39 of the world's greatest historical characters. One may question the young Girón's right to a place among such notables as Romulus and Remus, Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, Arthur, Charlemagne, Cleopatra, the Cid, Fernando and Isabel, El gran Capitán, Carlos V, Don Juan of Austria, the second and third Philips, *et al.*, but Lope's exaggerated estimate of him remains only the more significant. In a forecast of reconquest heroes strikingly analogous to that of *Guerras*, *La hermosura de Angélica*, after citing the Giróns with the Córdobaes, Guzmáns, and 24 other noble families, again grants particular attention to don Rodrigo:

Al gran Girón, que comprará tan caro  
el nombre perdurable y victorioso.<sup>10</sup>

These lines allude to the young Maestre's brilliant death at Loja in 1582, an event that I believe<sup>11</sup> Lope must have celebrated at length in his lost *La muerte del Maestre*, a play listed in the 1604 *Peregrino*. Lope attests his familiarity with don Rodrigo in *El remedio en la desdicha* (v. 1504), where he refers to him only as *el de la Roja Cruz*. The fascination that this gallant figure exercised on Lope is curiously evident in *La divina vencedora*, also before 1604. This play, which deals with the taking of Seville by Fernando *el Santo*, likewise king of the analogously handled *Guerras*, drags don Rodrigo Girón into its action with the utmost

<sup>9</sup> Bk. III, *BAE.*, xxxvii, 85-8.

<sup>10</sup> Canto xv, *Obras sueltas*, II, 236. *La hermosura de Angélica* was written in 1588 but retouched before publication in 1602. Cf., *ibid.*, p. 147: "el gallardo Girón exento y libre."

<sup>11</sup> Reasons have been included in a study of the *Historical Elements of* . . . '*Fuente Ovejuna*.'

disregard for historical truth. Don Rodrigo's presence here constitutes a glaring anachronism, of which only an early Lope could have been guilty. There can be no question of the young Girón's identity, for Lope tells us exactly who he is, and then calls him by his title: *Maestre de la Cruz de Calatrava, Maestre de Calatrava, el de Calatrava*.<sup>12</sup> Of the 30 Grand Masters of Calatrava only 2 were Giróns, don Rodrigo and his notorious father, don Pedro. The former, whom Lope makes a very minor and perfunctory character<sup>13</sup>—mere noble background, for which, dramatically, any name would have served as well—has been introduced not because he has any connection whatsoever with the plot, but either because Lope entertains an insuperable interest in don Rodrigo himself, because he feels that through him he may appeal to the Duque de Osuna,<sup>14</sup> or because don Rodrigo has become, through ballad, so traditional a figure of the Grenadine *Vega* that he is readily associated, especially in the popular mind, with any Reconquest exploit.

Lope's inclination to flatter the Giróns seems to have been quite as great as was Mira's. The question, however, is not one of comparison but, absolutely, merely of Lope's own willingness either to court the Duque de Osuna's favor or to express gratitude for favors already received. And Lope did both. The following data by no means afford a complete survey of Lope's relations with the Duque, but with the above evidence of his sustained interest in the young Grand Master of Calatrava, they suffice to prove that the complimentary allusion to Osuna in *Guerras de amor* cannot of itself be accepted as in the slightest degree indicative of authorship other than Lope's; that on the contrary, at precisely the most probable date of *Guerras*, 1616-1619, Lope's eulogy of Osuna was especially fervent.

The laudatory compositions preceding the first edition of *La Dragontea* (1598) include a sonnet by the Duque de Osuna, himself a poet of merit. Lope returns this compliment by mentioning the Duque with especial honors in Canto I:

<sup>12</sup> Acad., *Nueva ed.*, iv, pp. 620b, 639b, 645a, 646a.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 620b-621a, 635a, 639b, 645a, 646a.

<sup>14</sup> Cf., *ibid.*, p. 639b: "¡No seré yo Girón si no los mato!" And *La competencia en los nobles*, Acad., *Nueva ed.*, iv, 267b: "¡Al fin, Girón!"

Ni aquel Girón de Osuna, descendiente  
de tantos valerosos capitanes,  
a quien España coronó la frente  
contra los moros de Xerez galanes.<sup>15</sup>

In 1599, it is to the Duque de Osuna that Lope dedicates *La Arcadia*. One of the sonnets encrusted in this work, ostensibly an epitaph for don Gonzalo Girón, concludes with another noteworthy compliment to Lope's patron, a compliment of which our *Guerras* passage is not without reminiscence:

Aquí yace el maestre de Santiago  
que a España de un girón dejó vestida  
de gloria y honra que inmortal se llama;  
el que haciendo en los moros estrago,  
dió el alma al cielo y en Moclín la vida,  
a Osuna gloria y a su nombre fama.<sup>16</sup>

The complimentary verses of Gaspar de Barrionuevo, included among the preliminaries of *La Arcadia* (BAE: 38, p. 46b), significantly congratulate Lope less on his work than on his having been able to enrich his *pellico* with "Girón tan noble . . . tan alta guarnición."

Sonnet 176 (En láminas de plata, en letras de oro) of those published in *La hermosura de Angélica, con otras diversas rimas*, 1602, and reprinted in *Parte I* of Lope's *Rimas humanas* in 1604, 1615, 1619, is dedicated "Al Duque de Osuna," and Sonnet 38 (El tiempo a quien resiste el tiempo en vano), likewise dedicated to him, plays flatteringly on his family name, *Girón*, by which he is again eulogistically addressed in Sonnet 114.<sup>17</sup>

With these antecedents, one is not surprised to find Lope paying the Duque de Osuna compliments in three different passages of *Viuda, casada y doncella*, obviously written in 1616 and very soon after the Duque's departure to Naples as Viceroy,<sup>18</sup> at just about the time of *Guerras de amor*:

<sup>15</sup> *Obras sueltas*, III, 191.

<sup>16</sup> BAE., xxxviii, 74b.

<sup>17</sup> *Obras sueltas*, IV, 227, 208, 246. This evidence of Lope's friendliness toward the Duque de Osuna at this epoch would seem to confirm Aubrey Bell's belief that, as regards the problematical treatment of the Cárdenas of Córdoba, Lope sided with the Giróns rather than with Cervantes. Cf. Bell's "Who was Cardenio," *MLR.*, xxiv (1929), 69, 71.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. M. A. Buchanan, *MLN.*, 1909, p. 465a.

*Alferez.* Que todos van contentos con extremo,  
sólo en saber que al rey Felipe sirven,  
que van a Italia, a Nápoles la bella,  
y que al virrey dignísimo acompañan,  
gloria de los Girones andaluces.<sup>19</sup>

*Haquelme.* ¿Dónde era vuestro camino?

*Feliciano.* A Italia, en buena ocasión,  
pero en desdichado sino,  
cuando el español Girón  
de Osuna a regirla vino.

*Haquelme.* Conozco su gran valor.

*Feliciano.* Es un gallardo andaluz,  
de España y del mundo honor.

*Haquelme.* Gran vasallo de vuestra cruz.

*Feliciano.* Y su antiguo defensor.

*Haquelme.* Desde la Sierra Nevada  
está el Africa enseñada  
a temer esos Girones.

*Feliciano.* Son españoles leones;  
de reyes sangre heredada.<sup>20</sup>

*Feliciano.* hallé pasaje a Italia  
vestido en hábito pobre,  
porque iba entonces a ella  
el mejor de los Girones,  
aunque hice mal en hablarle  
y recibir sus favores.<sup>21</sup>

There are five eulogistic allusions to the Duque as Viceroy of Sicily (1610-1616) in Lope's *El desdichado por la honra*.<sup>22</sup> This tale, published in *La Círce* in 1624, was, as is proved by reference to Felipe III as the reigning monarch, certainly written before March 31, 1621, and quite possibly even several years earlier.

While still Viceroy of Naples, Osuna sent a eulogy of Lope for inclusion in the *Expostulatio Spongiae* (pub. June 1618), and

<sup>19</sup> Acad., Nueva ed., x, 465a. Cf. *Diálogo militar*, BAE., xxxviii, 263b: "un jirón tengo español, / fuera de haberle servido / y haber nacido en España."

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 470a.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 481.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *Obras sueltas*, viii, 86-9, 104: "aquel magnánimo príncipe . . . aquel gran señor . . . deste generoso príncipe, acción tan digna de su ilustrísima sangre . . . con esto se embarcó Felisardo, atrevido y desatinado mancebo, pues en casa de tan generoso príncipe pudiera estar seguro . . . este gallardo príncipe. . . ."

about May 6, 1619, more substantially expressed his appreciation with a gift of 500 *escudos*.<sup>23</sup>

In *Quien todo lo quiere*, dated by Sr. Angel González Palencia<sup>24</sup> as of about 1618 or 1619, Lope again goes out of his way to celebrate the Duque de Osuna's generosity:

El gran Duque de Osuna  
rige aquel reino agora;  
. . . . .  
no tiene el mundo quien honraros pueda  
como este generoso  
Príncipe, en tierra y mar siempre dichoso.<sup>25</sup>  
Sirve al Virrey, que en el mundo  
nadie honra más los soldados.<sup>26</sup>

Though one cannot determine whether these passages were inspired by expectation or gratitude, or both, to me the latter seems the dominant note. The case is perhaps a bit clearer in *Los esclavos libres*, included in the 1604 *Peregrino* list but, as Cotarelo has convincingly noted, probably retouched—like *El remedio en la desdicha*—shortly before it was printed in Lope's *Parte XIII* (aprob., Sept. 18, 1619), “sólo por tener ocasión de ensartar los repetidos y grandes elogios que dedica al virrey. . . .”<sup>27</sup> The Duque de Osuna has even been made one of the characters of this play, but his rôle, limited to three scenes in the last act, serves little more than to allow the protagonist, Leonardo, to pay him his compliments in person, and to grant a curious audience an actual glimpse of an impressive and not ungracious dignitary. One beholds the Duque going to mass and administering justice, the latter by a set of queries and commands too perfunctory, however, to lift this character much above the status of mere interlocutor. Although a careful reading of the play reveals the by no means salient fact that the action must be considered as passing in the

<sup>23</sup> Letter to the Conde de Lemos, May 6, 1620: “Yo he estado *un año* sin ser poeta de pane lucrando, milagro del señor duque de Osuna, que me envió quinientos escudos desde Nápoles” (*Obras sueltas*, xvii, 402; Rennert y Castro, *Vida*, p. 270).

<sup>24</sup> Acad., *Nueva ed.*, ix, xxix.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166a.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 169a. Cf. also pp. 168a, 183.

<sup>27</sup> Acad., *Nueva ed.*, v, xxiii. That Cotarelo should have confused *Parte XIII*, 1620, with *Parte XII*, 1619, in no way effects his point.

time of the First Duque de Osuna, from 1581 to 1586 likewise Viceroy of Naples, it is evidently the Third Duque de Osuna that Lope sought to please even before the *comedia* was re-touched. Certain passages that clearly "van encaminados a una persona viva" <sup>28</sup> can apply only to the *virreinato* of the grandson, but some of the compliments are transferable and may well have been included in the first redaction. The original date of composition is clearly subsequent to the First Duque de Osuna's death in 1590 and to that of the Second Duque de Osuna on November 25, 1594. Indeed, portions of the play may perhaps have been first written, at a decent interval after the Second Duque's death, to celebrate—simply by recalling the first Duque—the Third Duque's assumption of his title. Rather violently interpolated compliments to the Duque de Alba <sup>29</sup> not only afford another instance of Lope's incidental praise of a *magnate* other than the one praised throughout the play, but suggest composition during or shortly after the Alba secretaryship. However, a slightly later date is much more probable. In *El Peregrino*,<sup>30</sup> Lope expressly mentions *Los esclavos libres* as having been produced by Granados, "gallardo, galán gentilhomme y de la tierra del Peregrino." The reference is doubtless to Antonio Granados, whom the description fits and whose theatrical activities, at precisely the probable epoch of the *Peregrino's* composition, had just warranted his inclusion among the eight *autores* authorized by the decree of 1603. Granados, who was managing his own company in 1602, had as late as 1598 been an actor under Alonso Velázquez in Seville.<sup>31</sup> Since one may reasonably assume with Rennert that Lope is speaking of a first performance,<sup>32</sup> *Los esclavos libres* must have been written

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xxiv.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 434b, 435a.

<sup>30</sup> *Obras sueltas*, v, 463.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Rennert, *The Spanish Stage*, p. 487.

<sup>32</sup> That the first performances of *El soldado amante*, likewise mentioned in this *Peregrino* passage (*loc. cit.*, p. 462), was that by "Alcaraz, único Representante y de sutil ingenio," is not necessarily contradicted by the Parma MS. of this play: "Representólo Osorio, autor antiguo y famoso." Although Diego López de Alcaraz had a company of his own in 1596 and was called *autor de comedias* as early as Feb. 1594, in July 1594 he was an actor in the troupe of Rodrigo Osorio (Rennert, *op. cit.*, p. 511). The *estreno* of *El soldado amante* may have occurred at this time. Apparently,



between 1598 and 1603.<sup>33</sup> This is confirmed by the fact that *Lucinda*—Lope's poetic name for Micaela Luján—is made the daughter of a *Capitán Luján* from Espinosa de los Monteros, which provides, as Cotarelo observes,<sup>34</sup> an approximate date for at least the play as mentioned in the first *Peregrino*: certainly not before early 1595, the most generous *terminus a quo* for Lope's amours with Micaela, and probably not before 1599.<sup>35</sup> Lope seems very willing to identify himself with *Lucinda's* lover, Leonardo, who as a boy had followed Juan of Austria to Flanders in 1576. If it were assumed that Leonardo must have been about 14 years old at this time,<sup>36</sup> he would in 1581-86, the epoch of the play's action, have been from 19 to 24 years old, exactly Lope's own age at this time. This further identification of dramatist with protagonist makes it quite natural that Leonardo should serve as Lope's mouth-piece for the majority of the passages eulogizing the Duque de Osuna:<sup>37</sup>

Leonardo. ¿A quién nos presentáis? [as slaves]

Francisco. Al señor Duque de Osuna.

Leonardo. Téngolo a buena fortuna  
que a tan gran señor nos dais;

Lucinda. Ve a servir al gran Virrey,  
pon en un Duque de Osuna  
la carga de tu fortuna,  
que tiene sangre de rey.  
En él mi esperanza fundo;  
mira que el menor *girón*

Lope refers to the actor's performance, the manuscript to the manager's production.

<sup>33</sup> W. L. Fichter, "Notes on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's *Comedias*," *MLN*, xxxix, 270: "1599-1603?"

<sup>34</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 404b n. Cf. pp. 436b, 414a, 417a, 423b. On the evidence of the Epistle to *Lucinda* in *El Peregrino*, the Sierra Morena has generally been accepted as Micaela's birthplace. These passages in *Los esclavos libres*, which despite the obvious fiction of contemplated marriage have a ring of truth, afford an important contradiction.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Rennert y Castro, *Vida*, p. 106; Rodríguez Marín, *Lope de Vega y Camila Lucinda*, *Bol. Real. Acad. Esp.*, I, 253; Castro, *Alusiones a Micaela Luján . . .*, *RFE*, v, 257-259.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *loc. cit.*, p. 436a: "Que con la tercera paga me salió el primero bozo, que bien pudieran las canas."

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 426a-b, 428b, 433a, 435ab, 429b. Also, p. 427b.

- de aquel divino blasón  
puede ser capa del mundo.
- Duque.* ¿Eres noble en tu tierra?
- Leonardo.* Mis principios  
lo parecieron; humillóme el tiempo,  
que sube las privanzas a las nubes  
y da con las ciudades por la tierra;  
mas no quiero pensar que me derriba,  
que, cuando fuera rey de toda el Africa,  
tuviera por más próspera fortuna  
servir a un gran virrey Duque de Osuna.
- Leonardo.* Sólo puedo' esperar que a mi fortuna  
ponga remedio el gran señor de Osuna.
- Fabricio* [to *Duque*]. Pero vos sois Rey <sup>38</sup>  
en quien la piedad alabo.  
. . . . .
- Leonardo.* Y éste que ves,  
que es un palo de tu silla,  
que siendo tuyo este palo  
a cualquiera vara igualo  
de justicia de Castilla,  
no le tuvieron respeto;  
maté al uno de los tres  
por 'honra del palo, que es  
de tu persona, en efeto.
- Rosales* [to *Leonardo*] ¡ . . . buen amo tenéis!
- Zulema.* ¡E cómo bueno!  
. . . . .
- Leonardo.* ¡ Oh, gran casa de Reyes!  
. . . . .
- Zulema.* Bon amo estar Xamón Doqui de Osuna.

An acceptable explanation of the retouching of *Los esclavos libres* is suggested by the fact that it could not have occurred long after Lope's receipt of the 500 *escudos*, of which the play might be taken as a sort of public acknowledgment. Lope's gratitude for favors received is best expressed, however, in a poem *A la venida del Duque de Osuna de Italia a España*:<sup>39</sup>

<sup>38</sup> In a note on Miss Mabel M. Harlan's edition of Lope's *El desdén vengado*, I have suggested that the *Rey de Nápoles* of that play may at moments represent the *Virrey de Nápoles*, our Duque de Osuna. The use of *Rey* in the above passage confirms this suspicion.

<sup>39</sup> *Obras sueltas*, IX, 245-249.

... O Gran Girón ...  
 Yo siempre a sus grandezas obligado,  
 a cuyos beneficios almas debo,  
 inclito vencedor de mi fortuna,  
 ... haré que a eterna llegue [tu casa].

And shortly before :

No es en tu sangre esta alabanza nueva,  
 si España agradecida sus anales  
 revuelve a ver tus inclitos blasones,  
 con tan heroica y siempre ilustre prueba  
 de sus pechos valientes y leales,  
 que son los que le faltan tus *Girones*.

The occasion of this *silva*, which was not published until the posthumous *La vega del Parnaso*, 1637, leaves no doubt that it was composed in 1620, at precisely the most critical moment in the Duque de Osuna's career. It therefore constitutes the most sincere testimony of genuine friendship and admiration that Lope could have paid his patron. Nothing could be more significant of their relations than this sticking to a sinking ship.

C. E. ANTIBAL

*Ohio State University*

---

### LOPE DE VEGA'S *PEREGRINO* LISTS NOT *TERMINI A QUO*

The lists of *comedias* in the two editions of Lope de Vega's *Peregrino en su patria*, 1604 (dedication of late 1603) and 1618, known to bibliographers as P and P<sup>2</sup>, present a fairly complete survey of his dramatic work up to the respective dates.<sup>1</sup> The lists are not complete, however, for either date. He wrote some plays before 1603 not included in P, and some between 1603 and 1618 not included in P<sup>2</sup>. Hence the assumption is not sure that because a title does not appear in P, the play dates from after 1603, or that because a title does not appear in P<sup>2</sup> (or P), it dates from after 1618. Because scholars of high repute have repeatedly used, and are still using, this fallacious assumption in attempting to estab-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S. Griswold Morley, *Lope de Vega's 'Peregrino' Lists*, Berkeley, Calif., 1930. P has 219 titles, P<sup>2</sup> 210 (new) titles.

lish Lope's chronology,<sup>2</sup> it is desirable clearly to set forth the fact.

The following plays of Lope, demonstrably composed before 1603, are not in P: *Los hechos de Garcilaso de la Vega*, in four acts, and considered one of the very earliest;<sup>3</sup> *El príncipe despeñado*, autograph 1602. Additional examples, less certain of date, are: *El amante agradecido*, considered by Hämel and Cotarelo as of ca. 1602; *El desposorio encubierto*, placed by Cotarelo before 1600; and *La venganza venturosa*, which Ruiz Morcuende, on not too certain grounds, thinks written before 1594.<sup>4</sup>

The following plays of Lope, demonstrably in existence between 1603 and 1618, are not listed in P<sup>2</sup> (or P): *La discordia en los casados*, autograph 1611; *Don Juan de Austria en Flandes*, performed before June 29, 1604; *La imperial de Otón*, printed 1617; *El mejor maestro el tiempo*, printed 1615; *La Reina Juana de Nápoles*, printed 1615.

Without doubt neither of my lists is complete, since, for one reason, many of Lope's dramas must have disappeared. Yet one derives from the scarcity of traceable omitted titles the impression that P and P<sup>2</sup> were compiled with considerable care, and omit few of his authentic dramas, for the periods they cover. The omission of a title from P and P<sup>2</sup> creates, accordingly, a strong presumption that the play did not exist in 1603 and 1618, respectively. But presumption does not equal certainty, and must not be confused with it.

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY

*University of California*

<sup>2</sup> A few examples, which could be multiplied, follow. "La comedia de Lope [*El genovés liberal*] es posterior a 1604, pues sólo aparece citada en el *Peregrino en su patria*, de 1618"; E. Cotarelo y Mori, *Obras de Lope de Vega*, Acad. N., VI, xi. Similarly A. González Palencia, *ibid.* IX, xxxvii (*El secretario de si mismo*) and IX, lviii (*El testigo contra sí*). Américo Castro (*Rev. Filol. Esp.*, V (1918), 278, n. 1) expresses the opinion that a play written a short time before 1604 might not be included in P, but implies that a piece of much earlier date would certainly be included.

<sup>3</sup> If this is the *Garcilaso de la Vega* of P, then *El cerco de Santa Fe* is not, and the latter could serve as our example. Prof. Fichter plausibly infers that it was written before the death of Philip II, 1598 (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX, 1924, 269).

<sup>4</sup> Acad. N., X, xix. This title is in P<sup>2</sup>, and it is worth noting that Sr. Morcuende does not, like his editorial colleagues, assume that the play must have been composed after 1604.

TIRSO'S *SANTA JUANA*, PRIMERA PARTE

Of the Biblioteca Nacional manuscript of Tirso's trilogy the *Santa Juana*, the entire *Primera Parte* and almost all of the *Tercera Parte* are in Tirso's own hand.<sup>1</sup> His signature appears seven times on the manuscript.<sup>2</sup> The authenticity of the latter as an autograph seems never to have been questioned: Paz y Melia,<sup>3</sup> La Barrera,<sup>4</sup> Cotarelo<sup>5</sup> and Señora de los Ríos<sup>6</sup> all attest its genuineness. Furthermore, a comparison of the manuscript of Tirso's *Historia de la Merced*, unquestionably autograph,<sup>7</sup> with parts one and three of the *Santa Juana* manuscript reveals in each instance a handwriting that is the same, except for minor differences that might easily have developed during the twenty-five years that elapsed between the writing of the two works.<sup>8</sup>

It is with the *Primera Parte* only of the play that this brief article is concerned. Three points regarding its manuscript—hereinafter called *M*—seem never to have been noted previously: that it is most probably a copy and not the original draft of the play; that it is a version considerably revised from the original; that the date of the original draft is probably not May, 1613 but a slightly earlier date.

We are led to believe that *M* is a copy by various bits of evidence: 1) Writing too rapidly, Tirso occasionally omitted a line he should have copied; he then crossed out the line just written and copied the correct one; often the line he crossed out appears in its proper location further down on the folio; 2) sometimes he

<sup>1</sup> The *Segunda Parte* and the last three and one-half folios of the *Tercera* are not autograph.

<sup>2</sup> In Part I, at the beginning of Acts I and II and at the end of Act III; in Part III, at the beginning of each of the three acts and at the end of Act II.

<sup>3</sup> *Catálogo . . . de las piezas de teatro . . .*, Madrid, 1899, p. 464a.

<sup>4</sup> *Catálogo . . . del teatro antiguo español*, Madrid, 1860, pp. 383a, 387a.

<sup>5</sup> *Comedias de Tirso de Molina*, Madrid, 1906-7, II, xxxvñ.

<sup>6</sup> *El enigma biográfico de Tirso de Molina*, Madrid, 1928, p. 55.

<sup>7</sup> Señora de los Ríos reaffirms its authenticity in the *Enigma . . .*, pp. 53, 59; Señor Cotarelo, *op. cit.*, I, lxxi, note, calls it a "manuscrito original y autógrafo."

<sup>8</sup> The *Historia*, now in the Archivo de la Historia, was finished in 1639. The *Primera Parte* of the *Santa Juana* manuscript was completed in May, 1613, and the *Tercera Parte* in Aug., 1614.

left out a line and later wrote it at the end of the preceding line, in the margin of the folio; 3)<sup>1</sup> at times he made such obviously visual errors as writing *cauellerero* for *cauallero*,<sup>9</sup> *aviendo* for *avriendo*,<sup>10</sup> *soy* for *soys*; <sup>11</sup> intending once to copy *y mira que rebusnas* . . . , he wrote *y mira que rebuscar*, saw his error and crossed out the line. But, his attention again wandering a bit, he repeated the mistake by writing *buscar* at the end of the line. He then crossed out and rewrote the entire line correctly.<sup>12</sup> Although this type of error might possibly have been made if Tirso had been composing the first draft of the play, it is more reasonable to conclude that such mistakes were the result of hasty or careless copying.<sup>13</sup>

If the evidence just adduced is insufficient to establish strongly the probability that *M* is a copy, more is at hand. For—and we come now to the second point of discussion—it will be shown that *M* is a revision of another version, made by Tirso himself; as such it must necessarily be a copy, unless made from memory. We shall show later that it could hardly have been so made.

As the first step in the proof that *M* is a revision of the original draft of the play, we can show that it differs considerably from the first published version.

This version is that in Tirso's *Quinta Parte*.<sup>14</sup> This text—let us call it *Q*—contains 3826 lines; in *M* these are cut some six

<sup>9</sup> See Cot., II, p. 245a, l. 7.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 247a, l. 39.

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 246b, l. 12.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 247b, l. 19.

<sup>13</sup> The alterations and errors in the manuscript will be discussed in detail in a forthcoming edition of the play.

<sup>14</sup> Published in 1636. It contains only the first two parts of the *Santa Juana*; the third part was not published until Señor Cotarelo put it into his *Comedias de Tirso*, II, which has the first two parts also. In his publication of the first part, Cotarelo ignored the manuscript in great part, although he states: "De él nos hemos servido para la impresión que va en el presente tomo [i. e., vol. II of his *Comedias de Tirso*] . . . , sin olvidar su cotejo con el empresario . . ." (See *op. cit.*, xxxvb). The third part of the play, though taken directly from the manuscript, is still not free from error: Aldonza's speech, p. 310b, ll. 40-41, should read: "Bueno: / ¿Por qué, celos, si esto veis, / dice el mundo que sois ciegos?" "Guió", p. 314a, l. 18, should be "guisó." "Acá fíos," p. 328a, l. 27, should read "quatro años." Considerations of space prevent the correction of other more minor errors.

hundred.<sup>15</sup> The detailed differences between the two versions may be enumerated thus:

1) Occasionally, but not often, single lines in *Q* are omitted completely in *M*.

2) In twenty-five instances entire stanzas of *Q* are lacking in *M*.<sup>16</sup>

3) Six complete short scenes of *Q* are not in *M*.<sup>17</sup>

4) One hundred sixty-six single lines in *Q* are equivalent in meaning to the corresponding lines in *M* but are worded quite differently; sometimes those in *Q* show no similarity at all to those of the other text except as regards idea; again, an occasional line of *Q* is found crossed out in *M*, with a different version written above it, still in Tirso's hand. Then there are lines in *M*, literally on every folio, which differ only by a word or two from those of *Q*.<sup>18</sup>

5) A few complete passages of one or more stanzas in *Q* are in *M* recast in different language expressing the same or different ideas.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> There are 2830 lines in *M*. Folios are missing as follows: the sixth of Act I, the eighth and sixteenth of Act II as well as parts of the seventh and ninth, the eleventh of Act III. As Tirso averages about seventy lines per folio, the play as he left it in the unmutilated *M* must have run about thirty-two hundred lines.

<sup>16</sup> The longest single passage omitted in *M* is in Act I (see Cot., II, p. 240a, l. 31 to p. 241b, l. 13). This one hundred sixty-nine line description of a rustic picnic is not necessary to the development of the play's action.

<sup>17</sup> Scenes 10 of Act I, 4, 19 and 22 of Act II, 13 and 14 of III (See Cot., II, pp. 246a, 253a, 261b, 262a, 270b, 271a).

<sup>18</sup> Lack of space forbids the citation of the many examples of this type of change. However, one kind of alteration is particularly interesting: Tirso seems to have become more "rustic-conscious" during the making of the revised copy, for *nos* of *Q* is often *mos* in *M*, *huera* is found for *fuera*, etc. It is possible that the manuscript-source of *Q* contained these rustic bits and that the publisher of *Q* edited them out.

<sup>19</sup> The most conspicuous example of this kind of alteration is in Act II, sc. xviii, where, beginning with the ninth line of the scene and ending with the fifty-second, Tirso changed the passage so much as to have one of the characters, *Francisco Loarte*, betray not resignation at the loss of his betrothed but violent protest, voiced in a threat to destroy the convent in which she has taken refuge from his amorous advances.

6) In five instances passages in *M* are longer than the corresponding ones in *Q*.<sup>20</sup>

7) In *Q* the *Santa* is thirteen years old; in *M* she is seventeen.<sup>21</sup>

8) There is even a difference in the casts of characters: the number remains the same but there are six characters in *Q* which *M* does not have: *Marco Antonio*, *Ludovico*, *Santo Domingo*, *Decio*, *Cecilia*, *un criado*. In *M*, *Carlos* and *Claudio* replace *Marco Antonio* and *Ludovico*. The other four in *M* that are different are *El niño Jesús*, *Celia*, *Nuestra Señora*, *una muger*.

Incidentally, this lack of correspondence between the casts was responsible for an absurd error in *Q*:<sup>22</sup> *Marco Antonio*, speaking to *Ludovico*, addresses him as "Claudio." Evidently the publisher of *Q* had before him a copy of *M*'s text, otherwise he could hardly have been familiar with the name Claudio. Just why he chose this one line, or perhaps the entire speech, from *M*—if it did not come from there<sup>23</sup>—is a puzzle. "Ludovico" is too long for the line. Perhaps the manuscript<sup>24</sup> from which *Q* was taken was blurred or blotted in that particular area, or a folio lost.

Having noted, then, the numerous differences between *M* and *Q*, we come to the second step in the proof that the former is a revised version: obviously one of the two texts must be a revision of the other, or of a third, unless one of them was written from memory. This seems impossible because *M* and *Q*, in spite of their differences, are nearly enough identical that surely one must have been copied line by line from the other, or from its source-text, except of course at those places where Tirso chose to revamp his material. Consequently, since either *M* or *Q* must be a revision, made by Tirso with the other, or its source, before him, we

<sup>20</sup> For the last *redondilla* on p. 241b (Cot., II), *M* has two; for "para en uno son" (p. 242b, l. 41), *M* has three lines; preceding line one of p. 243a, *M* has eight lines not in *Q*; for lines 40 and 41 of p. 245a, *M* has eight; for the last twenty-one lines of Act II, sc. xvii, *M* has thirty-two. None of these expansions is long because Tirso was interested in shortening the *comedia* to a length more suitable for staging, doubtless at the request of an *autor*.

<sup>21</sup> The reason for the change in age is not plain.

<sup>22</sup> See Cot., II, p. 244a, l. 12.

<sup>23</sup> The folio of *M* that probably contained the line is lost.

<sup>24</sup> There is no record of a *suelta* which could have been *Q*'s source.



are faced by three hypotheses:<sup>25</sup> either that *Q* came from *M*, that *M* and *Q* had a common source, the original draft of the play of which *M* is a revision, or that *M* and *Q* came from separate and differing versions of the *comedia*, which themselves in turn were made from a common source.

This last-mentioned hypothesis seems the most untenable; Tirso probably would not have taken the trouble to make three different versions of the same play, particularly as time would have been rather short for it: the book from which the material for the *comedia's* plot was taken did not appear until 1611<sup>26</sup> and *M* was finished in May of 1613. As regards the first hypothesis, that *Q* came from *M*: if the latter is a copy, and we accept the belief that *Q* came from it, we are driven again to the improbability that there were three different versions of the play. Again, *Q* is a text longer than *M* by some six hundred lines. It seems unlikely that Tirso first wrote a short version, *M's* source, then lengthened this into the text used by the publisher of *Q*, making it longer than the standard length of a *comedia* of the day. Particularly would such an expansion have seemed unwise since *M* had proved so successful as to bear licenses for production in eight cities.

Furthermore, we often discover in *Q* certain lines, parts of lines, or words which we find also in the corresponding passages of *M* but which there have been crossed out and replaced by what seemed to Tirso more acceptable readings. If *Q* was taken from *M*, how shall we explain the inclusion in the former of those expressions rejected in *M* as undesirable? Rather, there must have been a manuscript-text, that which served as *Q's* source, which antedated *M* and of which *M* must be a revision. That is, we seem to be forced to the acceptance of the second of the three hypotheses above, that *M* and *Q* had a common manuscript source, the original draft of the play. *Q* probably was copied line by line from it, except for one imperfect line doubtless not in the original.<sup>27</sup> Why did *Q's* publisher not use *M*, the revised version? Perhaps because *M* at that time, as it is now, was so mutilated that no complete text of the *comedia* could be reproduced from it.

<sup>25</sup> It is obvious that *M*, written and signed by Tirso in 1613, could not have come from *Q*, published in 1636.

<sup>26</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Act I, sc. xv, l. 14 (Cot., II, p. 248a).

Could *Q* have been an expansion of *M* by some other author than Tirso? The sameness of the two texts destroys such a probability. Even that passage of *Q* which most differentiates it from *M*<sup>28</sup> contains some of the most Tirsonian material of the play, the sly and cynical humor, the realistic rural touches—and some unrealistic ones too—characteristic of the great playwright.

As regards the date of the play: *M* was written between the 20th and the 30th of May in 1613. We do not know the date of *M*'s source, the first draft of the *comedia*, but it is probable that it was written only a short time before *M*. Tirso seems to have taken the material for the play from Daza's *Historia . . . de la bienaventurada Virgen Santa Juana de la Cruz. . .*<sup>29</sup> This was published in 1611. It may be that Tirso knew the *Historia* in manuscript or even that he was familiar with its source, some unpublished memoirs of a Sor María Evangelista, containing a biography of the Santa and written during the latter's life (1481-1534). But it seems more logical to believe that the published *Historia* was used, since it would doubtless be the most available. So the *Santa Juana, Primera Parte* must have first been written between the latter part of 1611 and the very early part of 1613. Probably the date was not later than the latter part of 1612, since Tirso likely let a few months elapse between the first and second writings.

GERALD E. WADE

University of Tennessee

---

### FINAL *S* PLUS *N*-GLIDE IN MEXICO

In his *The Phonology of the Spanish Dialect of Mexico City*,<sup>1</sup> C. C. Marden stated:

A striking characteristic of Guadalajara (in the State of Jalisco, Mexico) is the adding of a *n*-glide after a final *s*: ARROZ (= *arros*) > *arrosn*, PUES > *puesn*. This *n*-glide is caused by lowering the velum before the *s*-sound is completed; the tongue-position remains the same and stream of

---

<sup>28</sup> See note 16 above.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Cot., II, xxxvii. A detailed comparison of Daza and the *comedia*, graciously made by Mr. E. W. Bieghler of the Ohio State University, verifies the truth of the assertion.

<sup>1</sup> Baltimore, *MLA.*, 1896, p. 49; reprinted from *PMLA.*, XI (1896), 133.

breath continues its passage through the nose, thus producing the nasal-glide. Semeleder, in speaking of the inhabitants of the State of Jalisco, states "dass sie den Worten ohne Auswahl einen nāsaleden Klang anhangen." My own observations of the speech of Guadalajara limit the nasal glide to words ending in *s* or *z*.

A. R. Nykl, in his "Notes on the Spanish of Yucatán, Vera Cruz and Tlaxcala,"<sup>2</sup> questions Dr. Marden's statement, as well as his quotations from Semeleder, saying: "As regards the supposed Guadalajara forms (p. 133), *arrosn*, *puesn*, I presume that this should read *arrosñ*, *puesñ*."

When I reported to Dr. Marden my own observation of the truth of his statement, after hearing it for years in Guadalajara, he requested me to publish a statement to that effect, but I postponed this in the expectation that I would be able to add data concerning a final *r* plus the *n*-glide. Of this I have not yet proof to offer.

Anyone familiar with colloquial Spanish in Guadalajara knows that Dr. Marden was quite right (and that the pronunciations given by Dr. Nykl as corrections also occur). Mexican cartoons and other take-offs of illiterate speech commonly reproduce *posn*, the final *n*-glide seeming to occur particularly when followed by a pause, as in: "¿Quién esn?—Posn . . . quién sabe," or "¿Cuántos quiere? Dosn?" I have verified this linguistic phenomenon many times over, and have known of its occurring in the speech of a *criada* from as far north as Chihuahua. But the New Mexican Spanish shows no sign of it.<sup>3</sup>

Neither Dr. Marden nor Dr. Nykl calls attention to a distinctive feature in the Mexican employment of the *n*-glide, and that is the sharp rise in the voice pitch which frequently accompanies it, such as would be represented in music by as great an interval as a major fifth or even a sixth in such an expression of surprise as: "¿No quieres masn?" This seems to come under the head of syllabic consonants, but Dr. Espinosa does not discuss it.<sup>4</sup>

LEAVITT O. WRIGHT

University of Oregon

<sup>2</sup> *MP.*, xxvii (1930), 458.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. M. Espinosa, *Estudios Sobre el Español de Nuevo Méjico*, Buenos Aires, 1930, § 200.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the chapter on *Consonantes Silábicas* in his *Estudios*.

GLOSSES ON *EL BERNARDO* OF BERNARDO DE  
BALBUENA

Professor Van Horne in his excellent study of Balbuena's *El Bernardo*<sup>1</sup> does not concern himself with the indebtedness of the Spaniard to Ariosto and other poets in the matter of minor details. Naturally, this kind of influence is considerable, but here we shall limit ourselves to a few illustrative instances in the hope that it will furnish some stimulus for a more minute search of the borrowed elements that appear in this poem, which next to Ercilla's *Araucana*, justly ranks as the most outstanding product of the Spanish Golden Age in the field of epic poetry.

When Balbuena compares the princess of Cathay to a bird caught in a snare (Book XIII), he is adapting to a different situation the simile used by Ariosto in *Orlando Furioso*, XXIII, 105. Compare

Cual simple pajarillo que en la fuente  
De una falsa hermosura convidado,  
Su presto vuelo entre la liga siente,  
Sin ver como, impedido y atajado,  
Y mientras menos su prision consiente,  
Mas revuelto se halla y mas ligado . . .

(*Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, XVII, p. 284)

to

Come l'incauto augel che si ritrova  
In ragna o in visco aver dato di petto  
Quanto piu batte l'ale e piu si prova  
Di disbrigar, piu vi si lega stretto . . .

The apostrophe to Spain in Book XVI is couched in terms reminiscent of a part of Petrarch's sonnet *Se Virgilio* . . . Compare

Oh venturosa España si tuvieras  
De tu Eneas un Maron segundo,  
O a tus nuevos Aquiles un Homero,  
Cuan poca envidia hubieran del primero . . .

(*op. cit.*, p. 308)

Se Virgilio et Omero avessin visto  
Quel Sole il qual vegg'io con gli occhi miei,  
Tutte lor forze in dar fama a costei

---

<sup>1</sup> In the *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, Urbana, Illinois, 1927.

Avrian posto, e l'un stil coll'altro misto:  
 Di che sarebbe Enea turbato e tristo,  
 Achille, Ulixe e gli altri semidei . . .  
 (*Il canzoniere* [ed. Scherillo] Milan, 1918, 337)

Elsewhere, in Book IV, 182, Balbuena adapts for one of his stanzas the octave and ending of Petrarch's popular sonnet: *Pommi ove 'l Sole . . . Compare*

Pomme al sol la seca arena abruga,  
 O donde él muere envuelto en tierna nieve;  
 Pomme al cielo que llueve ardiente brasa,  
 O al que nieve, granizo y rigor llueve;  
 Por donde el día con su carro pasa,  
 O la callada noche el suyo mueve;  
 Que en luz, tinieblas, en calor, y en frío  
 Dejaré, por ser tuyo, de ser mío . . .

to

Pommi ove 'l Sole occide i fiori e l'erba  
 O dove vince lui il ghiaccio e la neve;  
 Pommi ov'e 'l carro suo temprato e leve,  
 Et ov'e chi ce 'l rende o chi ce 'l serba:  
 Pommi in umil fortuna od in superba,  
 Al dolce aere sereno, al fosco e greve;  
 Pommi a la notte, al dì lungo ed al breve, . . .  
 Sarò qual fui, vivrò com'io son visso,  
 Continuando il mio sospir trilustre.<sup>2</sup> (*op. cit.*, 303-4)

An octave in Book XV is a metrical *tour de force*. It is an imitation of a famous octave from the classical Italian translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* by Anguillara. Van Horne does not mention that at this point the account of the increasing prominence of *Engaño* with each of the four ages of Man corresponds closely to

<sup>2</sup> It is known that Balbuena imitated the Petrarchan *canzone*: *Chiare, fresche e dolci acque* in his *Siglo de oro* . . . (Madrid ed., 1821, p. 21) and the *canzone* to the Virgin in *Grandeza mexicana* (1604 ed. fol. 14). Cf. Van Horne, *op. cit.*, 125. Incidentally, the line in Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato* I, 1, 31: *Il meglio veggio ed al peggior m'appiglio* . . . which Van Horne cites in connection with the Ovidian paraphrase of Balbuena, is not directly of classical derivation but is very close to a line in Petrarch's *Canzoniere* (*op. cit.*, 419)—*E veggio 'l meglio et al peggior m'appiglio*. Juan Ruiz de Alarcón in *La prueba de las promesas* (*B. A. E.* xx, 446) seems to follow Ovid:

Blanca: *Conozco lo mejor, y aunque lo apruebo  
 Elijo lo peor; que en daño mío  
 Huye la inclinación de albedrío . . .*

the progressive spread of evil in the world after the Golden Age as related in the first book of the *Metamorphoses*. It would be difficult to distinguish between the material Balbuena may have drawn from the translation and that drawn from the Latin original; but I am inclined to believe that Anguillara is a fertile source if not the chief source of the Ovidian matter that Balbuena includes in his epic. Compare

Estaba el fuego, el aire, el agua y tierra  
Sin forma de agua, tierra, de aire y fuego.  
El aire duro, líquida la tierra,  
Enjuta el agua, sin su fuego el fuego,  
Pesado el aire; sin pesar la tierra;  
Quemando el agua, y enfriando el fuego;  
Aunque sin aire, fuego, tierra ni agua  
Ni enfriaba el fuego ni quemaba el agua. (*op. cit.*, p. 300)

to

Pria ch'l ciel fosse, il mar, la terra, e'l foco  
Era el foco, la terra, il cielo, e'l mare;  
Ma'l mar rendeva il ciel, la terra, e'l foco  
Deforme il foco, il ciel, la terra, e'l mare.  
Che ivi era e terra, e cielo, e mare e foco  
Dove era e cielo, e terra e foco e mare;  
La terra, il foco, e'l mare era nel cielo;  
Nel mar, nel foco, e ne la terra il cielo.<sup>3</sup>

It should be noted that between Anguillara's and Balbuena's stanzas there is one important distinction. Anguillara's version is a *jeu poétique* playing on the antithesis *foco—mare* according to a custom that was very popular among the sixteenth century sonnet writers. Since the effect of such a composition rests basically upon the idea of an antithesis which, in his version, Balbuena does not perfectly illustrate, we must place the Italian stanza on a higher level as a technical and artistic achievement though, of course, Anguillara can hardly expect to reap glory from such a trifle. This contrast between the end-words is, however, better carried out by another Spaniard—Acevedo—who has an imitation of the above-mentioned Italian stanza in Book I of his *Creación del mundo*.<sup>4</sup>

A poem attributed to Tejada and copied from a seventeenth cen-

<sup>3</sup> In the fourth edition of the *Metamorfosi di Ovidio ridotte da Giovanni Andrea dell'Anguillara in ottava rima*—Venice, 1571, I, 3. For the location of this octave, which is often quoted separately, I am indebted to Professor W. L. Bullock.

<sup>4</sup> Quite erroneously in this connection M. Thibaut de Maisières in *Les*

tury manuscript by Gallardo (*Ensayo*, I, 1069), also contains an octave in which Anguillara is imitated even more closely than in the foregoing Spanish derivations. Compare

Antes de haber tierra, aire, mar y fuego,  
Era el fuego, la tierra, mar el aire,  
Rendía el aire al mar, la tierra el fuego  
Sin forma el fuego, tierra, el mar y el aire.  
Que allí era el aire, el mar, la tierra y fuego  
Donde era el fuego y mar, la tierra y aire  
El mar y el aire y fuego eran la tierra,  
Y había fuego en mar, y aire en la tierra.

But Tejada was seemingly not satisfied as were his compatriots with one imitation of this lucubration, since in the same poem he wrote another octave built on the same pattern. Compare

Estos fueron Norte, Euro, Austro y Favonio,  
Favonio junto al Euro, y Norte al Austro;  
Y el Austro y Norte al Euro y al Favonio.  
Favonio rendía al Euro, el Norte al Austro;  
Y allí había Austro, Euro, Norte y Favonio.  
Donde Favonio y Norte y Euro y Austro  
Era el Euro, Favonio, y Austro, el Norte,  
El Austro, el Euro y Favonio, el Norte.<sup>5</sup>

In the last part of the Decit-episode Balbuena has *Engaño* play the trick of interchanging the shafts of Death and Love. This is, of course, a clever adaptation of one of Alciato's emblems which had already been imitated by other Spaniards. Compare

Llegó una tarde (ie. Death) de matar cansada,  
Donde en las alas yo de Amor vivía  
Y a citar para la última jornada

---

*poèmes inspirés du début de la Genèse à l'époque de la Renaissance*, Louvain, 1931, p. 63, speaks of Acevedo's stanza as an imitation of a similar procedure in Du Bartas' *Semaine*. Obviously, Anguillara's octave is a closer and better unit of comparison than Du Bartas' four and a half lines. Cf. the comment in a review of Thibaut de Maisières' book in *Hispanic Review*, I, 250-1.

<sup>5</sup> Seventeenth and eighteenth century imitations of the technique of Anguillara's stanza abound. Cf. Fray Diego de Hojeda: *La Cristiada* (B. A. E. XVII, 424); Tommaso Campailla's *L'Adamo ovvero il mondo creato* (Siracusa ed. 1783), Canto VI, 36; VII, 116; VIII, 179; IX, 34, 93; XX, 58; *La lira a due corde, sonetti e canzoni siciliane, eroiche e sacre del Signor Melchiorre Rome* (Palermo, 1722), 54, 67, 139; *Poesie siciliane, giocose, serie e morali composte dal Rev. Sacerdote D. D. Stefano, Beneficiale Melchiorre* (Palermo, 1795), 11, 177, 275.

De parte del gran Jupiter me envía;  
 Dile una rica cena, y sobornada  
 De un lleno frasco, mientras vino el día  
 Troqué a las venas de su aljaba estrechas  
 Por las rubias de Amor, sus negras flechas.  
 Y ya con la sutil traza seguro,  
 Y el mundo en no advertido riesgo puesto,  
 Con un tiro el Amor al reino oscuro  
 El mancebo enviaba mas dispuesto;  
 Y de la seca murete el arco duro  
 Del viejo helado el carcomido gesto  
 Alegre en sangre ardiente remozaba  
 Y trataba de amor y enamoraba.<sup>6</sup> (op. cit., 301)

to

Errabat socio Mors iuncta Cupidine; secum  
 Mors pharetras, parvus tela gerebat Amor.  
 Divertere simul, simul una & nocte subarunt;  
 Caecus Amor. Mors hoc tempore caeca fuit.  
 Alter enim alterius male provida spicula sumpsit;  
 Mors aurata, tenet ossea tela Puer.  
 Debuit inde senex qui nunc Acheronticus esse,  
 Ecce amat, et capiti florea sarta parat.  
 At ego, mutato quia Amor me perculit arcu,  
 Deficio, injiciunt, & mihi fata manum.  
 Parce puer; Mors, signa tenens victricia, parce;  
 Fac ego amem, subeat fac Acheronta senex.  
 (*Emblemata*, Padua, 1621, 688)

An important critical essay on Balbuena's *El Bernardo*, which was apparently missed by Professor Van Horne, is Alberto Lista's *Examen de Balbuena* written in 1799 but not published until 1856, when it appeared in the Sevillian *Revista de ciencias, literatura y artes*, vol. III, 81-92 and 133-143. A discussion of Lista's essay is beyond the scope of this paper. We should, nevertheless, mention that the Spanish critic points out the Virgilian sources of two Balbuena octaves. The model of stanza 130, XXIII—*Cual en el libre mar*—is the *Aeneid* VII, 718 ff.—*Quam multi Lybico*—, that of stanza 16, XVI—*Es fama que*—is the *Aeneid* III, 578 ff.—*Fama est*—.

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

*Northwestern University*

<sup>6</sup> For evidence of a more direct acquaintance with Alciato's emblems on the part of Balbuena see *La Grandeza mexicana* (*Carta al Arcediano*) [Van Horne ed.] in the *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, Urbana, Ill., 1930, p. 43.



TWO UNPUBLISHED ANECDOTES BY FERNÁN  
CABALLERO PRESERVED BY  
WASHINGTON IRVING

The story of the friendship between Washington Irving and the young Spanish marchioness who later became "Fernán Caballero" has already been told elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> For years scarcely more than a pious literary legend, it has been proved by recent discoveries to have been an actual fact and one of real importance in the lives of both authors.

Irving met the Marchioness of Arco Hermoso in December 1828 and from then until the following May, when he left Seville, he saw her rather often—at the opera, at the theater, at her town house, and at her husband's country estate near Dos Hermanas.<sup>2</sup> At the very beginning of their acquaintance she entertained him with stories of the lives and thoughts of the Andalusian peasants, stories whose contents he jotted down in his note-book from memory. Later she showed him manuscripts of these and other anecdotes. A couple of the latter Irving carried with him when he returned to America. He still had them in his possession more than three years later when he received a letter from the marchioness's father, Johann Nikolaus Böhl von Faber, congratulating him on the appearance of his *Tales of the Alhambra*. Irving's reply to Böhl is among the most interesting of his letters:<sup>3</sup>

New York, April 20th 1833

My dear Sir

I was most agreeably surprized by the receipt of your letter of Feb 20 having no right to calculate on such a favour. I am still more gratified to find you are pleased with my *Alhambra*; and only regret that the restless life I have lead for the few last years has prevented my doing more justice to glorious

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Stanley T. Williams, "Washington Irving and Fernán Caballero," *JEGP.*, XXIX (1930), 352-366.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Ibid.* and *Washington Irving Diary, Spain 1828-1829*, ed. C. L. Penney, New York, 1926, pp. 89-91, 96, 98, 104.

<sup>3</sup> This letter, partly unpublished, is in the possession of the Conde de Osborne, who has kindly made it available for publication. Extracts from it were quoted in Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 355 and 362. The original spelling, punctuation and pagination have been retained in all quotations.

old Spain. I hope, however, in the course of a few weeks to have done with rambling and to fix myself for a time in a quiet country retreat on the banks of the Hudson, when I shall take up my

(fol. 1, v.) note books and memorandum, and endeavour to live over, and depict some of the scenes I have witnessed in Europe.

I have made a wide and varied tour in my own country since my return; having been to the "Far East" and the "Far West," and roamed among savage hordes and hunted the Buffalo upon his native prairie. The tour as you may suppose has been highly exciting, from the complete contrast it afforded to the scenes of European civilization. I am now on the point of setting out on an excursion to the western part of Virginia and among the Alleghany mountains, which must terminate my ramblings for a time.

(fol. 2, r.) I am happy to find a great revolution taking place among our winedrinkers and that Sherry is completely superseding Madeira: a change particularly favourable to my stomach. I wish you would have the kindness to send me <sup>4</sup> two *half Butts*, or whatever else you may call them, each of about 50 gallons, of the VERY BEST Brown Sherry. I want them to be of the same quality; and I merely ask separate butts to divide the risk. I ask this as wine that I may brag about—and I mean to make some of it procure you ample orders from Boston [*Shippe deleted*] Ship it to me at New York and draw upon Peter Ramsen & Co for the money. Recollect I ask this as from a friend and a loving brother of the pen; so send me the best your vineyards can produce.

Remember me most kindly to Mrs. Bohl, and to the Marchioness of Arcohermoso whose ms. I still treasure up and intend to go to work upon as soon as I can find proper leisure. Believe me

(fol. 2, v.) my dear Sir one who will ever rejoice to hear of your welfare and take a pride & pleasure in subscribing himself

your sincere friend

Washington Irving

Among some recently discovered papers of Irving's there has come to light a manuscript which in all probability is the one to which the last paragraph of this letter refers. It had been preserved

<sup>4</sup> Böhl was at this time manager of Duff, Gordon & Co., the English wine firm whose *bodegas* were located at Puerto Santa María in the heart of the sherry producing country.

along with the very notes which Irving had made on the stories the marchioness had told him and was acquired together with them by the Library of Yale University in the fall of 1932. It consists of sheets of paper, folded in the middle to form eight pages (each five and seven-eighths by seven and fifteen-sixteenths inches) and sewed. It is written in ink in the hand, not of the marchioness herself, but of her mother, Doña Francisca Larrea de Böhl,<sup>5</sup> who is known to have acted as amanuensis upon many occasions for both her husband and her daughter.<sup>6</sup> The manuscript contains two anecdotes, neither of which ever appeared among the published writings of Fernán Caballero, but both of which are very like her later writings in tone and subject matter; so that by every law of probability and inference they may fairly be ascribed to her. The manuscript is headed:

## ANECDOTAS

En el verano de 1828 se refirieron en varias tertulias de Sevilla las dos anécdotas siguientes, y que de los informes que despues se han tomado se duda de su certeza.

Then follows the first story:

## 1ª

En la última visita que hizo por esta diócesis el Obispo Auxiliar el Illmo. Sor. D. Vicente Roman y Linares, Natural de la America Española, acaeció al tiempo de hácer las confirmaciones en la Ciudad de Gerez de la frontera habersele presentado para recibirla un anciano, a quien para conferirsela pasó a confesar dho Prelado, teniendo el Dialogo que sigue: ¿Porqué ha estado vd. tantos años sin haber recibido este Sacramento?—Illmo. Sor., hace muchos años que ando buscando el sustento de pueblo en pueblo con motivo de no tener en este pays parientes ni amigos, trabajando en las labores del campo.—

(fol. 1, v.)

¿Pues de qué tierra es vd.?—Soy natural de América, y desde muy joven abandoné el suelo patrio á causa de evitar los rigores que temía de parte de mi padre, con motivo de haber herido en una disputa á un hermano mio mas pequeño en una pierna, recelando que haya muerto por haberse desangrado, si es que no pudieron acudir con tiempo a darle los auxilios

<sup>5</sup> For the identification of the handwriting we are indebted to the kindness of D. Antonio de Osborne, great-great-grandson of Doña Francisca.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. E. Herman Hespelt, "Francisca de Larrea, a Spanish feminist of the early nineteenth century," *Hispania*, XIII (1930), 173-186.

necesarios. Sorprendido el Obispo con una narracion que le recordaba un caso igual al que á el le habia sucedido en sus primeros años, despues de confesar á aquel hombre, le mandó se retirase á la Sacristia, preguntándole antes para asegurarse mas y mas de quien fuese este hombre singular por sus padres y parientes: lo que al fin acabó de confirmarle en sus sospechas. Habiendo pasado á la Sacristia, lláma al paysano, se desata las ligas, le descubre una

(fol. 2, r.)

pierna, y le pregunta si reconoce aquella herida que dió a su hermano en la cicatriz que le mostró en ella. Este hombre conoce al hermano que creia ya muerto, y á quien habia ofendido en tanto grado, se arroja á sus pies y le pide el perdon que creia no tener merecido. El Obispo por su parte lleno de gozo por haber encontrado á un hermano a quien muchos años habia estaba buscando inutilmente, lo recoje en sus brazos, le da un osculo de paz, le promete su proteccion y amparo; y en efecto, gozosos y contentos uno y otro salieron á la Iglesia, lo muestra al publico, le confiere la confirmacion y lo conduce á todas partes en su compañía.

The two principal motifs of this anecdote—variants of the age-old themes of the flight of Cain and the reconciliation of Esau and Jacob—are not found combined in any of the published stories of Fernán Caballero, but certain of its situations and relationships reappear in the *relación* entitled “Más largo es el tiempo que la fortuna.”<sup>7</sup> Here are found again, for example, two brothers, one of whom is a cultured clergyman, the other, a simple peasant. The peasant brother is a fugitive accused of a crime—parricide, not fratricide—which he did not commit. The priest, who has spent most of his active life in America, returns to Spain eager to find the brother who for years has been lost to him. Here the parallel between the two stories ends. “Más largo es el tiempo” does not conclude with confession and reconciliation; the priest arrives too late to save his brother from execution; he leaves Spain again and goes as a missionary to China.

The second anecdote, like the first, tells of the effect on human lives of absence and distance:

2<sup>a</sup>

En un pueblo de las montañas del norte de España se habian casado dos jovens

(fol. 2, v.)

honrrados y laboriosos; y segun la costum-

<sup>7</sup> First published in *Semanario Pintoresco Español*, Vol. XIII (1853), Núm. 19-21.

bre mas general en aquellos pueblos, pasó el marido luego que se casó, á agenciar y juntar caudal en la America, dejando su mujer al cuidado del Párroco de su Pueblo. En su consecuencia fué enviando á este los intereses que bien pronto iba adquiriendo en aquellos dominios. Por aquel tiempo recibió en su casa este Párroco un Sobrino suyo, á quien desde luego se propuso establecer ventajosamente, y para ello, pone las miras en la Mujer de aquel cuyo caudal administraba, y que iba creciendo de dia en dia, por las cuantiosas remesas de dinero que le iba haciendo; y como viviendo el Marido, no podia de manera alguna realizar su idea de enlazar la Mujer con el citado su sobrino, medita un medio extravagante y desusado de obviar aquel inconveniente sin atentar á los dias de aquel Marido inocente, cual fué el forjar una fée de muerto relativa al marido, que hizo

(fol. 3, r.)

pasar por veridica en el pueblo, creyendose por aquel instrumento ya viuda la Mujer; y fingiendo otra fée o testimonio de haber muerto esta misma, con cuyo documento llegado que fué á manos del marido, creyó de buena fée hallarse viudo, y como tal libre para elegir otro estado, y como estubiese cansado de la vida del siglo é inclinado á acabar quieta y pacíficamente el resto de sus dias en un claustro, tomó el habito de Religioso en un Convento de la America: donde lo dejaremos por ahora para volver al pueblo de su Naturaleza y ver el partido que al fin tomó su Muger. Esta viendose sola y desamparada, y deseando complacer al Párroco bajo cuya tutela se hallaba, quien le habia insinuado lo conveniente que seria para todos el que aceptase la mano de su Sobrino, el que por su parte habia ya prestado su conformidad, porque tenia ya concebida bastante inclinacion por la viuda, aceptó este partido, y en efecto se celebró el Ma-

(fol. 3, v.)

trimonio de ambos con universal aplauso viviendo muchos años felices y logrando una subcesion dilatada: cuando por las convulsiones politicas ocurridas ultimam<sup>te</sup>. con la America Española, se vió obligado el Religioso su anterior Marido a abandonar aquellos Payses y volver á su lugar nativo. Luego que este llegó alli y se avistó con el Párroco, autor de toda esta trama, se ausentó éste secretam<sup>te</sup>. para evitar el funesto golpe que podria caer sobre él. La mañana siguiente al dia que llegó el Religioso, quien hasta entonces no habia tenido lugar de darse á conocer en su pueblo, pasó á la Iglesia á decir misa, donde se hallaba su Muger, quien desde los primeros momentos que le vió, tubo los mas fuertes presentimientos de que aquel Religioso pudiese ser su antiguo Marido, que le habian hecho creer era defunto. Aguar-

(fol. 4, r.)

dó á que acabase el sacrificio, pasa á la Sacristia, le hace algunas cuestiones,

y por cuyas respuestas reconoce que aquel era su Marido, y que ambos habian sido victimas de la mas refinada supercheria; lloran sobre su triste suerte, buscan al Párroco para deshacer esta trama, se confirman por su fuga en la intriga que los habia conducido á unas resoluciones tan extraordinarias; y en este estado se habian elevado varias consultas á las autoridades competentes, sobre si podrian anularse los respectivos estados que nuevam<sup>te</sup>. habian abrazado en consecuencia de los falsos documentos con que los habian engañado, corriendo entretanto el rumor de que el Párroco habia pasado á Portugal; y otros decian por el contrario que habia sido aprehendido en Valencia al tiempo de embarcarse

(fol. 4, v.) para payses lejanos.

In this second anecdote there are obviously three principal themes or episodes: the departure of the ambitious young husband to America to make a fortune for his bride, the plot of the priest to whose care he has committed her, and the return of the living "dead" man. To the first and the last of these themes parallels may be found in the published works of Fernán Caballero. In a number of her tales, among them "La viúda del cesante," "Vulgaridad y nobleza," and "Más largo es el tiempo que la fortuna," America is pictured as a land of golden promise for adventurous young men. But the story in which there is a situation most similar to the opening situation in the above anecdote is called "Un tío en América"<sup>8</sup> and is the last of the six "Diálogos entre la Juventud y la Edad Madura" published under the title "Cosa cumplida . . . sólo en la otra vida." It is the story of a young peasant from Galicia who goes to America to earn money enough to be able to marry his sweetheart. By his industry and modesty he gains the good will of a rich uncle who sends him back to Spain with enough silver to insure his prosperity. He returns to find his plans frustrated and his hopes vain. His sweetheart's mother, who had chosen for her a different suitor, has intercepted and destroyed his letters and the poor girl, believing him dead or faithless, has died of a broken heart.

The closing theme of the second anecdote, the "Enoch Arden" motif, Fernán Caballero used later in the story "Estar de más."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> First published in *La España*, 1853, April 21-26, Núm. 1550-1554.

<sup>9</sup> It has not yet been possible to determine the date of the first publication of this story. The earliest reference to it which we have found is in an unpublished letter from Fernán to her friend Antoine de Latour in the

In this later story an absent husband, who has sailed across the ocean to America and the Philippines, is believed to have been lost at sea. His wife after a number of years marries again and a child is born of this second union. The husband, who has been almost miraculously preserved from shipwreck, finally makes his way home. He does not see his wife, but learns from the lips of his own child of the change in her situation and of her happiness in her new ties. Like Tennyson's hero, he decides to carry his secret with him to the grave.

The intermediate theme, that of the plotting priest and the double forgery, Fernán Caballero did not use again. She would have thought it unjustifiable to expose to the publicity of print a representative of the Church capable of such a felony.

If, as we must assume, these two anecdotes were written in 1828 or 1829, their value as a measure of their author's later development in style and use of material is not-negligible. They antedate by some four years the earliest date assigned to the German version of *Sola*,<sup>10</sup> her first published work, and by some sixteen years the specimen tales which she sent in manuscript to her father's friend Dr. Julius.<sup>11</sup> Of these other early literary attempts she kept copies which she reworked later for publication, but only a happy chance has preserved these two anecdotes from oblivion.<sup>12</sup>

New York University  
Yale University

E. HERMAN HESPELT  
STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

### COSA NADA EN EL ESPAÑOL NUEVOMEJICANO

En sus observaciones respecto a las voces habilitadas de sustantivos, Menéndez Pidal indica en su *Manual de Gramática Histórica Española* (edición de 1925, pág. 188, § 80<sub>2</sub>.) que muchas de éstas

possession of the library of the University of Chicago; in it she writes under date of December 16, 1856: "Mi *Nouvelle* que lleva por titulo *estar demas* se va a publicar en librito."

<sup>10</sup> Cf. (Elise Campe) *Versuch einer Lebensskizze von Johan Nikolas Böhl von Faber*. Nach seinen eigenen Briefen. (Als Handschrift gedruckt.), [Leipzig] 1858, p. 102.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Camille Pitoulet, "Les premiers essais littéraires de Fernán Caballero. Documents inédits," *Bulletin Hispanique*, IX (1907), 84.

<sup>12</sup> Irving apparently never used this material in his own writings.

"se usaban aún en la lengua antigua como adjetivos: 'un buey *noviello*,' 'el puerco jabalí,' 'unas *medias* calzas,' 'cosa *nada*.'" El español nuevomejicano parece atestiguar esta observación. En Nuevo Méjico y en el sur de Colorado, donde aun se conservan locuciones anticuadas en abundancia, se encuentra hoy día, con mucha frecuencia, la expresión "cosa nada" (L. *res nata*). Ésta según el uso nuevomejicano, se emplea solamente después de un verbo precedido de "no" y, en tal caso, equivale a "gran cosa." Así es que se oye decir muy a menudo, por ejemplo, "No hizo cosa nada" en vez de "No hizo gran cosa."

JUAN B. RÆL

*University of Oregon*

---

### PAIRE D'ARMES

In the *Vengeance Alixandre*<sup>1</sup> Jehan le Nevelon has on two occasions employed the phrase *paire d'armes*, supported by the six manuscripts which preserve the lines in question:

vv. 177-81 Fetes fere voz armes par ce biau temps d'esté,  
Si en fetes vint pere de fin or esmeré  
Et frain et seles d'or qui soient bien ouvré;  
Present en ferai fere Clicon et Tholomé.

vv. 384-86 Le plus fin or d'Arrabe fet trois foiz esmerer,  
Dont fet vint pere d'armes entaillier et overer;  
Aus pers le roy son pere les vodra presenter.

In each instance reference is to the plan of Alior, son of Alexander the Great, to divide twenty *paires d'armes* among the peers of the murdered ruler. Jehan le Nevelon's four mediaeval imitators, incidentally, all fail to mention this specific manner of largesse. The exact nature of the gift has not been indicated hitherto either by the Nevelon context or by the discovery of any further examples of *paire d'armes*. But a few other poems contain evidences pointing to an interpretation which, while not demonstrable, is at least satisfactory. In particular, the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Waldef*<sup>2</sup> provides the following passage (vv. 13975-84):

<sup>1</sup> Edited in No. 27 of the *Elliott Monographs*.

<sup>2</sup> Through the kindness of Professor Walther Suchier I have had access to this unpublished poem in the copy made by his father, the late Professor Hermann Suchier. The unique mediaeval manuscript (at Cheltenham) of *Waldef* is not available for research.



Mult iert bien armé rois Waldef:  
 Dous forz healmes ot en sun chief—  
 Li un iert plat e l'autre agu—  
 Qui grant mestier li ont eü,  
 E dous halbere avoit vestu  
 Qu'en meint estur s'orent tenu.  
 Od li porte dous mult bons branz,  
 Mult bien muluz e bien trenchanz;  
 L'un ot ceint, e l'autre tenoit  
 Dunt il meint grant colp i feroit.<sup>3</sup>

A still more resolute partisan of massive armor is king Hauce-  
 bier in *Aliscans* (vv. 6673-75):

En son dos ot .iii. blans haubers safrés  
 Et a son col .iii. fors escus listés  
 6674a Et en son chief .iii. vers iames gemés,  
 Et .iii. espees pendent a ses costés.<sup>4</sup>

Even in the boasting of the *Pèlerinage*,<sup>5</sup> Charlemagne admits a  
 measure of respect for lavish accoutrement:

454 Li reis Hugue li Forz nen at nul bacheler  
 De tote sa maisniee, tant seit forz et membrez,  
 S'ait vestut dous halbers et dous helmes fermez

460 Trencherai les halbers et les helmes gomez.

The three swords of Fierabras and a few further instances of extra  
 units in the fighting equipment of leaders are likewise noted in  
 some of the *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der*  
*romanischen Philologie*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> This passage was reproduced around 1400 in the translation of John  
 Bramis (*Historia regis Waldei*, ed. R. Imelmann, p. 173): "Erat autem  
 Waldeus suis armis valide munitus, nempe in capite duas gerebat cassides,  
 quarum inferior in superioribus plana erat, et exterior sicut plurimarum  
 est acuta composicio. Duabus quoque loricis induebatur et duobis gladiis  
 induebatur, una quam manu gestabat, alia qua circumcingebatur."

<sup>4</sup> From the edition of Wienbeck, Hartnacke, and Rasch.

<sup>5</sup> *Karlsreise* (ed. Koschwitz), vv. 453-64. My attention was called to  
 this passage by Professor D. S. Blondheim.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. Sternberg, *Die Angriffswaffen im altfranzösischen Epos*, XLVIII,  
 p. 15; V. Schirling, *Die Verteidigungswaffen im altfranzösischen Epos*,  
 LXIX, §§ 149, 150, 203, 265; V. Bach, *Die Angriffswaffen in den altfran-  
 zösischen Artus- und Abenteuer-Romanen*, LXX, §§ 4, 24, 107. I have  
 found no aid to the explanation of *paire d'armes* in the standard works on  
 armor by Laking, Viollet-le-Duc, and others. Incidentally, I see no reason  
 to link this phrase with Old Spanish *paria* (= "offering", "tribute").

The few personages entering into this discussion are without exception principals in epic warfare. Just as the *paire d'armes* in the *Vengeance Alixandre* is intended for kings alone, so in the other poems none but leaders arm themselves with additional weapons for defence or offence. The testimony which has so far presented itself to me argues that a *paire d'armes* is a double set of arms which includes two helmets, two shields, two hauberks, and two swords. The evidence further implies that all the component parts of a *paire d'armes* were borne in battle simultaneously. Such a hypothesis is supported, moreover, by the application of the word *paire* in v. 1577 of *Guillaume de la Barre*:

vv. 1574-77 E pueyss fey venir atertal  
 .III. pars de raubas,<sup>7</sup> totz d'un for,  
 E la dona, ses lonc demor,  
 La .j. par li [*i. e., her husband*] vay tost vestir.

But on the other hand, neither this passage nor the testimony from *Waldef*, *Aliscans*, and the *Pèlerinage* gives proof that *paire d'armes* in the *Vengeance Alixandre* does not mean two separate sets of fighting garb.<sup>8</sup> That the phrase applies to the rider alone and not to the horse as well is evident from v. 179 of the *Vengeance* itself. The most adequate single support for the interpretation advanced in this note is obviously the passage cited from *Waldef*.

Princeton University

EDWARD B. HAM

### IMMENSEE UND KEIN ENDE

In den *MLN* xli, 8 (Dec. 1926) spricht sich Porterfield gegen allzuhäufige Herausgabe von Storm's *Immensee* aus und weist überdies nach, dass der Dichter sich in diesem Jugendwerk allzu eng an *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* anlehnt.

Die angeführten Belege, so schlagend sie im einzelnen sein mögen, genügen meines Erachtens nicht, um den Beweis bewusster

<sup>7</sup> In his edition of the poem for the Société des Anciens Textes Français, Paul Meyer (Introd., p. xx) comfortably renders *pars de raubas* as "paires de robes."

<sup>8</sup> Note, for instance, that in *Girart de Vienne* (ed. F. G. Yeandle, v. 4944) Oliver enters battle accompanied by an attendant who carries a reserve supply of twelve hauberks.

Anlehnung zu erbringen. Es dürfte sich vielmehr nur um zufällige Übereinstimmung handeln, um einen der häufigen Fälle, in denen die literarische Reminiszenz mit dem literarisch Erlebten zusammenfällt. Es besteht wohl kein Zweifel, dass Goethe unserm Dichter vorbildlich war—und von welchem deutschen Dichter könnte das nicht gesagt werden—aber Storms Eigenart, seine bewusste künstlerische Sendung, bewahrten ihn vor allzu enger Abhängigkeit von Goethe.

Doch wenn schon von Abhängigkeit die Rede sein soll, dann möchte ich hiermit die Behauptung aufstellen, dass Storm dem ihm wesensverwandten Adalbert Stifter zum mindesten so viel verdankt wie Goethe. Storm und Stifter begegnen einander vor allem in der Beschreibung der Natur. Farbe, Klang und Duft werden bei beiden zu einem stimmungsvollen Gesamteindruck verwoben. Sonnenauf- und Untergänge, Mondnächte, Gewitter, dunkle Seen und besonders der Wald in seinen mannigfachen Stimmungen nehmen bei beiden den Hauptplatz ein, während die Menschen sozusagen nur als Staffage dienen. Beide bevorzugen typische Gestalten: Kinder, Liebende, Greise. In der Problemstellung finden sich bei beiden dieselben typischen Verhältnisse. Beide bevorzugen die Rahmentchnik.

Einige Zitate aus Stifter werden bestätigen wie wesensverwandt die beiden Dichter sind. Die Szene im Park in den *Studien* erinnert an die geheimnisvolle Begegnung im Garten kurz vor dem Gewitter in *Immensee*:

Dann wendeten sie sich; ich sah noch ihre Hand in seinem Arme liegend, ein dichtbelaubter Ulmenast stellte sich dann zwischen mich und sie—dann sah ich noch weisse Kleiderstückchen zwischen dem Baumgitter schimmern und dann nichts mehr—. Ich blickte noch länger, aber die Stelle blieb leer, und es war, als sei der ganze Garten leer. Der weisse einsame Obelisk zeichnete sich gegen die dunkelblaue Wand des Ostgewitters, das indess langsam heraufgezogen war—kein Vogel sang mehr in dem Parke, und ich drückte meine Stirn fester gegen den Stamm der Akazie, an der ich sass.”<sup>1</sup>

Auch hier bricht dann das Gewitter los und beide unglücklich Liebenden kommen vollständig durchnässt zu Hause an, das Herz voller Zweifel. Und so wie Elisabeth durch die unerwartete Lektüre des Liedes: *Meine Mutter hat's gewollt* in allen Tiefen

<sup>1</sup> A. Stifters, *Sämmtl. Werke*, Prag 1904, Bd. 1, S. 130.

aufgerüttelt wird, so wird der Held der Feldblumen mächtig bewegt durch den Gesang von Goethes Seelied. In Stimmung und Wortwahl am ähnlichsten, erinnert die bekannte schwüle Mondnachtszene in *Immensee* (1849) an folgende Stelle aus dem *Hochwald* (1842):

Breite Schatten rückten über Haus und Rasenplatz auf den See heraus, dieser war glatt und schwarz, nur auf dem Schiffe lag das müde Nachmittagslicht, eben so war der tote Vogel, wie ein weisser Punkt, beleuchtet und im grünrothen Schimmer floss es um das Gehäge der Fichten. Indess war man, dem Thiere näher rückend, auch bereits dem sumpfigen Ufer, wo das Gewirr der Baumstämme lag, so nahe gekommen, dass man jeden kleinsten Zweig ausnehmen konnte, ja in der Stille der Luft und des Wassers sah man es sogar deutlich, wenn ein Frosch, der sich sonnte, von einem Stamm in das Wasser sprang und die leichten Wellenringe fast bis auf den Floss auseinandertrieb. Endlich mit einigen langsamen Ruderschlägen war man dem Thiere so nahe gekommen, dass es Gregor mit der Hakenstange des Flosses herbeifischen konnte."<sup>2</sup>

Noch mehr Stellen dieser Art könnten angeführt werden, besonders in Bezug auf das Wasser. Storm hat eine fast perverse Vorliebe für dunkle, sumpfige, gefährliche Gewässer. Alle seine Selbstmordkandidaten finden den Tod im Wasser. Dies soll hier nur angeführt werden, um zu zeigen, dass seine Wasserszenen nicht auf bewusste Imitation Goethes und Stifters, sondern auf seine Natur- und Weltanschauung zurückzuführen sind.

LYDIA ROESCH

*West Virginia University*

---

### GETTING READY FOR BROOK FARM

Among the many treasures in the Harvard Library of interest to students of American life and letters is a commonplace book of George Ripley, the founder of Brook Farm. The first entries in the volume were made in 1822, when Ripley was at college, and the later ones were jotted down in 1840, about the time that the New England idealist preached his farewell sermon to his congregation on Purchase Street in Boston, told his parishioners that he was one of the despised Transcendentalists and reform men,

<sup>2</sup> Ebenda, S. 273.

and began to cast about to find a proper place in which to live the perfect life.

No better illustration of the fundamental characteristic of the man's nature could be found than the first quotation contained in the book: "I behold the bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightful studies." These words of Milton, so burdened with a desire to escape from the reality of work-a-day life to the reality of ideas, are followed by the passage from *Comus* in praise of philosophy, a selection from Bacon, and a few words of Edward Everett, the young man eloquent who had returned from Germany a few years earlier to bring to Harvard its first real knowledge of continental methods of instruction. Scattered through the commonplace book one finds a host of quotations from a variety of sources, such as Horace, Gibbon, Adam Smith, Locke, Coleridge, the Greek Anthology, and contemporary periodicals. Perhaps the most significant fact in connection with Ripley's early reading is that he made a pretty thorough study of the seventeenth-century authors. Milton easily leads the list, along with Jeremy Taylor, Burton, and "Old Herrick."<sup>1</sup>

The chief value of Ripley's commonplace book, however, is not its absorption in literary matters, but the evidence afforded that the founder of Brook Farm took pains to prepare himself to raise potatoes, and even "to make a beautiful and lasting whitewash," before he embarked upon his enterprise at West Roxbury. In planning his agricultural experiment, Ripley listed several possible sources of revenue:

1. Dairying.
2. Vegetable Garden.
3. Hay for Sale.
4. Corn and Potatoes for Sale.
5. Fruit for Sale.

Unfortunately, as the records show, the Brook Farmers were at times actually forced to buy vegetables for their own table, and what money they made came largely from their school and their printing press.

<sup>1</sup> The interest in the seventeenth century which Ripley's notebook exhibits is, of course, similar to that of Emerson, Thoreau, and others who were educated at Harvard during the period.

A certain idealism is manifest even in Ripley's scheme for the rotation of crops:

- 1st. year, 4 acres of roots keeps 10 cows.
- 2nd. year, 4 acres in corn, 4 acres in roots keeps 20 cows.
- 3rd. year, 4 acres in oats and clover, 4 acres in corn, 4 acres in roots keeps 30 cows. . . .

Had Brook Farm followed this plan with success, in a few years there would have developed a bovine problem of the "Pigs is Pigs" order!

The following entry is more characteristic in being more detailed so far as money matters are concerned:

Expenses and Profits of One Acre of Indian Corn

Manure, 40 loads at \$1 per load . . . . .	\$40.00
Labor of drawing manure and spreading, 9 days' work at .75 per day . . . . .	6.75
Ploughing twice, 6 days' work and plough . . . . .	5.50
Harrowing twice, 2 days' work . . . . .	1.50
Planting, 6 days' work, 4.50 and seed corn $\frac{1}{2}$ bu. .75 . . . . .	5.25
Hoeing, 10 day's work . . . . .	7.50
Topping stalks, 4 day's work . . . . .	3.00
Harvesting, 10 days' work . . . . .	7.50
Total, reckoning labor and board 75 cts per day	\$77.00
121 bushels of corn . . . . .	\$100.00
Fodder . . . . .	20.00
Net Income . . . . .	\$43.00

It may be seen from these figures that Hawthorne's activities in connection with "the Gold Mine," as he called the manure pile at Brook Farm, were worth just seventy-five cents a day. According to Ripley's notebook, the most valuable crop that the reformers could raise was one of rutabagas. Only four acres of these vegetables would net an income of \$336.25.

There are several entries similar to the one quoted, culled from various farm journals, such as *Hill's Farmers' Visitor* and *The New England Farmer*. The very last entry is a recipe for making twenty gallons of beer, at a total cost of seventy-eight cents!

The strange thing about Brook Farm is not its xixotic idealism, but its peculiar "New England" quality—an intellectual ideality with a typical admixture of facts and figures. It has too often been forgotten that at the very outset the trustees of the com-

munity were clever enough to mortgage their property for more than it cost them, and that their organization was effected as a stock company—to produce an income for its members.

Ripley's commonplace book proves that even the first plans for Brook Farm called for facts and figures as well as gorgeous day-dreams of Utopian bliss.

CLARENCE GOHDES

*Duke University*

---

### A DRAMATIC SKIT BY DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI

Among the unpublished portions of the letters of Rossetti to William Allingham<sup>1</sup> there is a short piece of drama, written in a half-playful, half-serious mood. According to Miss Violet Hunt,<sup>2</sup> he wrote several playlets of this sort and read them to weekly gatherings of his friends. This play alone, it seems, has survived; and we owe its existence to the fact that certain implications therein were sufficiently vital to impel Rossetti to transcribe the entire piece into a letter written to Allingham in August, 1854. The value of this short play lies principally in its several biographical connotations. Rossetti shows therein certain mannerisms of his Pre-Raphaelite Brethren, his growing estrangement from Millais upon the latter's early success, more especially some interesting allusions to Rossetti's painting entitled *Found*, and finally a definite statement by Rossetti concerning a circulating folio of sketches which failed to pass beyond his studio.

Of the two or more folios by which the Pre-Raphaelites sought to stimulate their fellowships and artistic development, the one mentioned here is the second, circulated in 1854. William Rossetti tells

<sup>1</sup> *The Holograph Letters of D. G. Rossetti to Wm. Allingham* are in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York City. By the kind permission of Mrs. Nell Allingham and Miss Belle da Costa Green, Librarian, I publish this excerpt from letter eleven, a portion omitted by G. B. Hill in his excellent edition of these letters in 1897. The freedom with which Rossetti indulged in personalities was, without doubt, the reason for omission.

<sup>2</sup> *The Wife of Rossetti*, New York, 1932, p. 104. Miss Hunt has commented in unflattering terms on Rossetti's dramatic powers. It should be remembered that such playlets were written, as were his sonnets *à bouts-rimés*, quickly and playfully. The piece is not reprinted here on account of literary merit.

us that Millais was the "prime mover in a plan, which never came to anything, to get up a sketching club on much the same system as that of the long-defunct Cyclographic Society."<sup>3</sup> William's brotherly solicitude here led him to refrain from stating why the plan "never came to anything," but other commentators place the blame upon Gabriel. A fuller account than William's is given by George Birkbeck Hill in his editorial notes to a letter by Rossetti, dated July 24, 1854:

The *Folio* was to contain drawings of a newly-formed sketching-club, of which Mr. Hughes gives me the following account: "Millais, who was the only man among us who had any money, provided a nice green portfolio with a lock, in which to keep the drawings. Each member of the club was to put into it every month one drawing in black and white, the case going around. Millais did his, and one or two others did theirs. Then the *Folio* came to Rossetti where it stuck for ever. It never reached me. According to his wont, he had at first been most enthusiastic over the scheme, and had so infected Millais with his enthusiasm that he at once ordered the case."<sup>4</sup>

William Rossetti and others who wrote on the Pre-Raphaelites attribute Gabriel's failure to coöperate to his dilatory habits and his sudden fluctuations of interest. Those statements are truth, but only a part of the truth, as our playlet will show. Rossetti's delay was the result, not so much of having no design completed for insertion into the *Folio*, as of being undecided whether or not to use his design of *Found*, already made, for that purpose. His reason for with-holding *Found*, and therefore being obliged to delay until another design should be finished, is given in Rossetti's own little drama. In the portion of his letter of August, 1854, which contains the playlet, Rossetti wrote: "I don't know what design I shall put in the *Folio*. I'm doing one of *Hamlet* and *Ophelia*, which I meant for it . . . but I fear I shall not get it done in time to start the *Folio* again soon, so may put in a design of *Found*."<sup>5</sup> At this point Dr. Hill, the editor of the letters to Allingham, began a new paragraph without indicating the omission of all that follows here. Rossetti's letter in manuscript continues: "Only, certain consequences haunt me, which may be shadowed forth in a rapid dramatic action:

<sup>3</sup> *Dante Gabriel Rossetti, His Family Letters*, ed. by W. M. Rossetti, Boston, 1895, I, 166.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters of D. G. Rossetti to Wm. Allingham*, London, 1897, pp. 42-43.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 47.



## MICHING MALLECHO—IT MEANS MISCHIEF

Scene 1 (Aug. 1854<sup>\*</sup>)

Robert St. Adelphi

Michael Halliday Esq. *solus*

*Hal.* (writes) "I've got the folio back at last from that lazy wretch Rossetti. In spite of your prophecy, he really *has* put in a design. The subject is"—(Halliday promises to describe subject and design at length—then goes on)—"I hope you'll be back as you promised, this day week, and that will see you at Collins's in the evening. Meanwhile I am yours sincerely, M. H." (He folds letter and addresses it, "John Everett Millais, Esq., A. R. A., Chatsworth, Derbyshire.")

Scene closes

Scene 2 (Sept. 1854)

Hanover Terrace, Regent's Park.

Charles Collins, Esq., Michael Halliday, Esq., John Everett  
Millais, Esq., A. R. A., P. R. B., &c.

*Mil.* Ah, Halliday, how—about that—

*Hal.* What?

*Mil.* Why, that he should have got the same subject that I'm going to paint. Did I show you my sketch for it? O, didn't I?

*Hal.* No. That *is* odd.

*Mil.* Ah, you Collins, it was you that knew it, just before I went into the country.

*Col.* Let's see—I don't remember—at least I'm not sure. I don't know.

*Mil.* Well, if you don't know, what's the use of your talking about it? What's the good of your sitting in the corner of that sofa with all your clothes on, if you've nothing to say? Stupid little fellow—you're as bad as my mother. Go & get me one of your pocket handkerchieves and wake up. (Exit Collins) I say, just tell your mother to get some tea.

Enter Frederick George Stephens, Esq., P. R. B.

*Steph.* (shakes hands with Millais) How are you old fellow? Looking stunning. Where's Collins?

*Mil.* O, he's gone out. I'm very glad to see you, old boy. What are you doing?

*Steph.* (shakes hands with Halliday) How are you old fellow?—(to Millais) Design!

*Mil.* Going to paint it?

*Steph.* Yes.

(a pause)

*Mil.* Going to put your design in the folio?

*Steph.* Put one in.

*Mil.* What is it?

*Steph.* "Death and the Riotours" from Chaucer.

<sup>\*</sup> Rossetti omitted the second parenthesis. I follow his punctuation.

*Mil.* O of course, I remember you beginning that when I painted "Isabella."

*Steph.* Yes.

(a pause)

*Steph.* Ah! Have you seen Gabriel's design in the folio? *Stunning!*

*Mil.* No, but Halliday told me. We were talking about that. Ah, it was you Stephens that I showed that design of mine to.

*Steph.* Which—? That in the folio? Yes! *Stunning!*

*Mil.* No—one I did some time ago like Gabriel's, about a woman and a market gardener—finding her in the street.

*Steph.* O, No. O, let's see though. Wasn't it one that wasn't mounted yet?

*Mil.* Yes, that was it.

(reenter Collins with handkerchief)

*Steph.* O Yes, I remember. *Stunning!* (to Collins) How are you, old fellow?

*Col.* (shakes hands with Stephens) How are you?

*Mil.* There, Collins, Stephens remembers that design of mine; (takes handkerchief from Collins) ask him—don't you, Stephens? There! Go and sit down again. When's that tea coming?

*Col.* Soon, I hope.

*Hal.* Are you going to paint that design of yours then?

*Mil.* Yes, I've got the canvas. My brother couldn't come tonight because he's drawing the perspective for me.

*Hal.* It'll be a bore for Rossetti.

*Steph.* Ah! Sorry for old Gabriel.

*Mil.* Lord bless you; he'd never have painted it, you know. You know him. Is he coming here tonight, Collins? Ah! he always keeps out of my way. I'll tell you who saw my design and said it was the finest thing he ever saw in his life—Allingham. Ask him.

*Steph.* He's gone to Ireland.

*Mil.* Ah! When's he coming back?

*Steph.* Don't know.

(a pause)

*Mil.* (to Steph.) O my dear fellow, you'll see when I paint this picture it'll come out the loveliest thing you ever saw in your life. I know of a brick wall to paint in it that's perfectly heavenly. (Goes on to describe brick wall at length) Ah! you wait till it's finished, Stephens,—you'll say it's wonderful, I know.

*Steph.* *Stunning*, old fellow.

*Servant* (entering) If you please, sir, tea's ready.

(Scene closes)

Scene 3 (May 1855)

Athenaeum Office

Hepworth Dixon Esq. *solus*

*Dix.* (writes) "Our readers will remember that there was one picture in the Royal Academy last year, in reviewing which, while we stated our

strong objections without reserve, we did full justice at the same time to the striking originality of the artist's conception. We allude to Mr. Holman Hunt's work entitled, *The Awakened Conscience*. Yesterday, at the private view of this year's exhibition there was no picture that attracted more notice than one to which the same objections present themselves, but to which also it would be impossible to deny the merit of perfect originality in the artist. We speak of Mr. Millais's *Found*. Our readers know that we are not defenders of the school, but it must be universally acknowledged that no living painter except Mr. Hunt and Mr. Millais, could have conceived the subjects of these two powerful works, etc., etc. (*Dia. finishes article & rings bell. Enter servant.*)

*Dia.* Is the boy waiting for copy?

*Serv.* Yes Sir.

*Dia.* Give him this. (scene closes)

#### THE END

What say you to my dramatic powers? Not to speak of historical truth, prophetic nerve, etc?

Rossetti's fear of competition with Millais is thus shown to be the principal cause of his failure to complete the work on *Found*. He had disregarded the claims to this theme of the lesser genius of William Bell Scott and even Holman Hunt, whose painting, *The Awakened Conscience*, has been named by William Rossetti and others as the deterring influence. William wrote that in 1854 his brother "was now inclined to lay aside" this piece of work "on the ground that Hunt, in his picture . . . had been treating a modern subject of somewhat similar bearing."<sup>7</sup> But we know that Rossetti had greater respect for the competition of Millais than for that of Hunt, and the playlet reënforces the belief that Millais's influence was the greater.

Another not uncommon explanation of Rossetti's failure to complete this picture is that expressed by Mr. Evelyn Waugh:

Rossetti had outgrown this didactic theme and ingenious treatment long before it was finished. It took him a year to get started, and then it was only with the utmost effort that he could banish the romantic images that danced in his imagination.<sup>8</sup>

It is true that ideal, romantic subjects out of the past lay nearer Rossetti's heart than did modern, realistic, and didactic themes; but let us not assume that *Found* was distasteful to the earnest young man who went on nightly rescue work with Hunt and

<sup>7</sup> *Ruskin, Rossetti, and Preraphaelitism*, London, 1899, pp. 10-11.

<sup>8</sup> *Rossetti, His Life and Work*, London, 1928, p. 64.

Deverell to exhort the women of the streets. He had already painted *Hesperia Rosa*, a subject purely didactic; he had written *Jenny*, and throughout life he considered it one of his most important poems. He wrote *Downstream* at Kelmscott years later. It seems therefore that Mr. Waugh's statement must be relieved of half its weight in view of these considerations and the evidence of the drama. Millais was the real obstacle.

Finally we should realize that until recently there was little or no published evidence that Millais ever worked on such a subject as Rossetti's *Found*. Miss Violet Hunt speaks often and freely in agreement with the view that he did so, and she needs no proof because her knowledge is first-hand. Rossetti's little drama is the proof which others of us feel the need of. The question of which of the two artists first considered the subject cannot, I fear, be answered satisfactorily.

The strange outcome of this affair was, as we know, not at all what Rossetti expected when he wrote to Allingham. First of all he did *not* eventually place his design of *Found* in the *Folio*, as he suggested to Allingham that he might do. The decision was made during the next month. He wrote to Allingham on September 19 that the *Folio* was still "by him." He added: "I shan't put in my modern design, and must finish one of two or three others I have going on, instead."<sup>9</sup> Second, it was Millais, not Rossetti, who gave up the project and never executed his design. Apparently Millais was less of a proselyte than Rossetti indicated. He refused to borrow or even seem to borrow from Rossetti. Gabriel, however, being more high-handed in nature and more often in need of money, undertook the painting of his design at later and intermittent periods.

M. L. HOWE

New Haven, Connecticut

---

#### PARADISE LOST, I, 549-62

Though various editors have suggested Thucydides, Plato, Cicero, and Valerius Maximus<sup>1</sup> as sources for *Paradise Lost*, I, 549-62,

<sup>9</sup> *Letters of D. G. Rossetti to Wm. Allingham*, p. 55.

<sup>1</sup> Plato's *Republic*, III, 399; Valerius Maximus, II, c. 6, § 2; Cicero, *Tusc. Quæst.*, II, 16.

the real source is Plutarch's "Life of Lycurgus" (*Parallel Lives*). A comparison of the two passages ought to be sufficient, but, since the passage in Thucydides bears a real resemblance to Milton's lines, it is quoted here. It will but show more clearly that Plutarch is the direct source.

Anon they move  
 In perfect phalanx to the Dorian mood  
 Of flutes and soft recorders—such as raised  
 To highth of noblest temper heroes old  
 Arming to battle, and *instead of rage*  
*Deliberate valour breathed*, firm, and unmoved  
 With dread of death to flight or foul retreat;  
 Nor wanting power to mitigate and swage  
 With solemn touches troubled thoughts, and chase  
 Anguish and doubt and fear and sorrow and pain  
 From mortal or immortal minds. Thus they,  
 Breathing united force with fixed thought,  
 Moved on in silence to soft pipes that charmed  
 Their painful steps o'er the burnt soil. (I, 549-62)<sup>2</sup>

PLUTARCH:<sup>3</sup> When their army was drawn up in battle array and the enemy near, the king sacrificing a goat, commanded the soldiers to set their garlands upon their heads, and the pipers to play the tune of the hymn to Castor, and himself began the pæan of advance. It was at once a magnificent and a terribly sight to see them march on to the tune of their flutes, without any disorder in their ranks, any discomposure in their minds or change in their countenance, calmly and cheerfully moving with the music to the deadly fight. Men, in this temper, were not likely to be possessed with fear *or any transport of fury, but with the deliberate valor* of hope and assurance, as if some divinity were attending and conducting them.

(Life of Lycurgus)

THUCYDIDES:<sup>4</sup> After this the conflict commenced; the Argives and their allies advancing with haste and impetuosity; the Lacedaemonians slowly, and to the music of many flute-players, placed amongst them according to custom, not with a religious object, but that they might advance evenly, stepping in time, and so that their line might not be broken, a thing which large armies are apt to do in their approaches to an enemy (v, 70).

FRED L. JONES

*Mercer University*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also *P. L.*, VI, 61-7; and *Of Education*, the paragraph beginning, "The interim of unsweating . . ."

<sup>3</sup> Dryden-Clough translation, I, 114; Boston, 1871.

<sup>4</sup> Translation by Henry Dale, Bohn's Library, London, 1851.

## MILTON'S SEASONAL INSPIRATION

The statement of Edward Philips that the poet Milton's "vein never happily flowed but from the autumnal equinoctial to the vernal," was apparently first questioned in print by John Toland in 1698: "I fancy he might be mistaken as to the time because our author in his Latin elegy on the approach of the spring (Elegy V) seems to say just the contrary."

But at least one other poet confesses to the same experience. In a letter to Joseph Hill, May 9, 1781, Cowper writes: "My labours are principally the production of the last winter, all indeed except a few of the minor pieces. When I can find no other occupation I think, and when I think, I am apt to do it in rhyme. Hence it comes to pass that the season of the year which generally pinches off the flowers of poetry, unfolds mine, such as they are, and crowns me with a winter garland. In this respect, therefore, I and my contemporary bards are by no means on a par. They write when the delightful influences of fine weather, fine prospects, and a brisk motion of animal spirits, make poetry almost the language of nature, and I, when icicles depend from all the leaves of the Parnassian laurel and when a reasonable man would as little expect to succeed as to hear a blackbird whistle."

EDWARD S. PARSONS

*Marietta College*

---

"LETTER TO C—— W"

The C—— W. of this scandalous "Letter" in *Poems on Affairs of State* (London, 1703), II, 143-6, beginning

Here take this W——, spread it up and down  
Thou second scandal Carrier of the Town,

was neither Charles Whitworth nor Carleton Whitlock, the guesses of J. Woodfall Ebsworth.<sup>1</sup> As the copy of the poem in Phillips Ms. 8418<sup>2</sup> shows, C—— W. was really Captain Warcup, the notorious Judge Edmund Warcup of Popish-Plot fame. There the poem is entitled "To Captain Warcup," and begins,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rowburghe Ballads*, IV, 562; V, 447, 448.

<sup>2</sup> Now Ms. Eng. 585 in the Harvard Library.

Here, take this Warcup; spread it up and down.

A comparison of the facts in Warcup's life and journals<sup>3</sup> with those in the opening lines of the poem shows that there is little doubt of the accuracy of the ascription. Dubbed "Captain Warcup" and taunted for his "stratagems of war," he had in fact been a captain in Ashley Cooper's regiment in 1659.<sup>4</sup> The "trap-stick legs and foolish puny face" of the poem were probably manifestations of scrofula from which he was not cured until the Civil War.<sup>5</sup> His journals bear abundant evidence of his interest in gossip and scandal, and his record in office is full of underhanded dealing. Tom Brown was probably referring to him when he wrote:

The whores have a tax laid on them towards their maintainance, in which they share with Captain W—— and the Justices of the Peace . . . 25 or 30 shillings gives them a license for whoring till next pay day.<sup>6</sup>

As mere blank-filling the establishment of C—— W. as Captain Warcup is only mildly interesting. But to the student of the political and satirical poetry of the Restoration, it makes certain what was doubtful before<sup>7</sup>—that if Julian, famous Secretary of the Muses, had a successor in the distribution of his libelous sheets, that successor was not the heretofore anonymous C—— W., for his scandal-mongering was in high places and not in taverns.

Cornell University

BRICE HARRIS

## REVIEWS

*Carlyle*. By EMERY NEFF. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1932. Pp. 282. \$3.00.

*Samuel Butler der Jüngere*. Von PAUL MEISSNER. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1931. Pp. 192. M. 14.

Mr. Neff has attempted not a biography but an interpretation of "the life and writings of Thomas Carlyle in the setting of his

<sup>3</sup> Keith Feiling and F. R. D. Needham, "The Journals of Edmund Warcup, 1676-84," *English Historical Review*, XI (1925), 235-60.

<sup>4</sup> Wood, *Life and Times*, ed. Clark, I, 311.

<sup>5</sup> Feiling and Needham, p. 236.

<sup>6</sup> *Letters from the Dead* (London, 1703), 72.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Ebsworth, *Rowburghe Ballads*, IV, 562.

time." In striving to fulfil his design he has collected and presented a large mass of information. In general, his estimate of Carlyle is high, almost as high as that of Froude who ranks the Sage of Chelsea among the prophets of Israel. In his last paragraph, Mr. Neff suggests that the time is perhaps ripe for a return to Carlyle.

"The chastened mood of the moment is auspicious," run the words of the paragraph. "The dogmas of democracy and *laissez faire* are shaken, Science, especially the physics that tried Carlyle's faith, no longer speaks the language of crass materialism. Moral responsibility, lately out of fashion, begins to be perceived as the indispensable cement of a fast disintegrating society. The great public is listening to writers who say incompletely and imperfectly what Carlyle said with unparalleled brilliance and cogency. If Victorian clouds do not shroud his lightnings, it may next turn to him. In our partially aroused state we have need of his obstinate faith that the modern world contains resources for its own salvation. The stupendous scale of the contemporary scene dwarfs our thinkers. We must await men of Carlyle's range and stature for the achievement of a social synthesis, if procrastination has not already put it beyond human capacity. Until Titans arise, we will look with envy and regret at the lost opportunity of a generation that had a Carlyle."

The most unsatisfactory feature of the interpretation is the treatment of Carlyle's humor. In my opinion, we shall never have an adequate estimate of Carlyle until some one arises who is able to evaluate the place and the purpose and the import of humor in his work. At the root of what many look upon as bilious raving is humor. Diction, sentence structure, epithets, and repetitions are motivated by humor. Perhaps only a humorist great as Carlyle himself will be equal to the task of interpreting this quality. Notwithstanding Mr. Neff's inability to grasp equally well all the qualities of Carlyle's complex nature, every student will, I am sure, care to measure his own notions against those of the author.

The serious defects of the work arise from the design. The book leaves a painful impression of having been written down to the level of the lowest order of American college students, for whom everything must be predigested. The style likewise impresses as a too hasty assembling of material from a teacher's notebook. Facts thrust down the throats of students or general readers will never make for the right kind of education. If Americans cannot be trusted for background, or for the desire to gain it by their own efforts, this kind of thing will do them little good. It is part and parcel of the predigested food which too many educational institutions are supplying. An interpretation should be an interpretation against a background of facts, to be sure; but the details of the background should never be allowed to efface the general effect



of the interpretation. The paragraphs on pp. 219 and 220 are not unfair examples of the author's method.

It is not alone for this general fault that the book should be censured. Much of the English is positively poor. A volume of this kind should not contain sentences like the following from pages 27, 34, and 99 respectively: "At night defence was necessary against gangs of footpads, one of which broke Carlyle's hat before being frightened away." "Which went to explain why Irving had had no call to a charge since securing his license to preach in 1815." "Unable to eat bread made by the maid or the Dumfries baker, Carlyle, accustomed to seeing his mother and sisters turn their hands to anything, casually asked his wife to bake some for him."

Both author and publishers should be taken to task for the numerous typographical errors: *ecstasy* (19), *effective* (44), *villification* (71), *Carlye* (178), *the every evening* (221), *Tober-na-Vuoloch* (208), *habitude* (164) for *hebetude*, *Barjag* (151) for *Barjarg*, *Thirwall* (repeatedly) for Bishop Thirlwall. On page 257 Jane Carlyle Aitken is referred to as Carlyle's niece and house-keeper.

As I lay the book aside, I am sure that the field is still open for two single-volume works about Carlyle—one a biography, the other an interpretation. As yet we have nothing to surpass John Nichol's brief biography in the old series of "English Men of Letters." Had all documents been available to Nichol, I doubt whether his work could be superseded. As an interpretation, Norwood Young's *Carlyle: His Rise and Fall* seems to me not sufficiently synthetic, constructive, and sympathetic. Mr. Neff, I regret to say, has not adequately taken advantage of a great opportunity.

The sub-title of Dr. Meissner's book *Eine Studie zur Kultur des ausgehenden Viktorianismus*, reveals its purpose. The author, frankly admitting the adequacy of Henry Festing Jones's *Samuel Butler*, has not attempted biography in any strict sense of the word. Rather, on the basis of what is already in print or in manuscript, and particularly on the authority of Butler's own writings, he has undertaken to tap the secret springs of the man's nature, to get at the motives of his revolt and to estimate the worth of his protest.

After a preliminary view, "Die viktorianische Kultur," there follow eight chapters and a *Personenregister*, the whole within the compass of 192 pages. The chapter headings show Meissner's mode of procedure: "Butler und die Pädagogik," "Butler und die Naturwissenschaft," "Butler und die Religion," "Butler und die Ethik," "Butler und die Kunst," "Butler und die Literatur," "Butler als Mensch," and "Butler in der literarischen Kritik."

The book is honestly wrought, and shows considerable insight. It will not, I think, reveal much to English or American scholars.

As evidence of the growing interest in the Victorians among continental readers it is welcome. It will have its value, also, for the English. Few things are better for the people of one country than to look at themselves through the eyes of the honest and the intelligent of another country.

WALDO H. DUNN

College of Wooster

---

*Elizabethan Plays, written by Shakespeare's Friends, Colleagues, Rivals, and Successors; edited with new texts based on the original folios, quartos, and octavos, by HAZELTON SPENCER.*  
 Boston: Little, Brown, & Company. Pp. ix + 1173. \$4.00.

Here is an anthology of Elizabethan drama that it is hard to praise too highly for its triple excellence of format—handsome binding, legible type, reproduction of old title-pages—scholarly accuracy, and illuminating comment and annotation. Its contents—twenty-eight plays—cover the whole range of Elizabethan dramatic production from the immediate fore-runners, and masters, of Shakespeare, Marlowe, Kyd, and Lyly, to the work of Shirley with its anticipatory foreshadowing of Restoration comedy. Every lover of Elizabethan drama has, of course, his own favorites. Your reviewer, for example, regrets the omission of such a masterpiece of tragi-comedy as *A King and No King* and the absence of any example of the mixed comedy and romance, such as *The Humorous Lieutenant*, well called by Swinburne, “the most delightful division of the poet’s work.” Perhaps a plea might be put in for the poignant tragic force of *’Tis Pity* as against the more formal and less human perfection of *The Broken Heart*; and there will always be those who prefer the tragic pathos of *The Duchess of Malfi* to the tragic energy of *The White Devil*. But no anthology can include all the masterpieces of Elizabethan drama, and this collection is at once more generous and more discriminating than many of its competitors. It is well to offer the beginner in this field four plays of Marlowe instead of the usual one or two; it is well to include *Bartholomew Fair* among the offerings from Jonson; and it is specially praiseworthy to present Dekker’s *Honest Whore*, a masterpiece of humorous realism and tender sentiment that anticipates the best work of a great Victorian novelist.

Each play in the volume is prefaced with a brief introduction dealing with date, source, editions old and new, and offering always a note of appreciative criticism, just enough to stimulate without satiating the beginner. These introductions are little masterpieces of condensation and, considering the amount and variety of their content, remarkably free from error. The allusion to the Enoch Arden motif in connexion with *The Shoemakers’ Holiday* is, per-

haps, not very happy. A hasty reader might take it to refer to the play itself rather than to the source. And as a matter of fact there is little likeness to this motif in the source, Deloney's *Gentle Craft*. All we have there is the incident of John the Frenchman interrupted in his courtship of an English girl by the appearance of his French wife. "O," quoth John, "I thought my wife had been dead, but seeing she is alive I will not lose her for twenty thousand crowns." This is a long way from Dekker's tale of Jane and Ralph and still farther from Tennyson's poem. The allusion might be cancelled in a later edition.

Special stress is laid in the Prefatory Note, as in the various introductions, on the new editing of the texts. Professor Spencer has made a rule of going to the original editions for his basic text, correcting that where necessary by the emendations of later editions and commentators. This might be thought a matter for the advanced student rather than the beginner or the general reader, but it is not. Too many editors have been content to reprint the first, not always the best, text that came to hand. We are only beginning to learn today how far the text of Shakespeare offered in popular editions differs from what the master really wrote. Specific praise can be given in this connexion to the editor's work on *Doctor Faustus*. It is not too much to say that we have here the truest and the most readable version of that ruined masterpiece ever offered to the reading public, an immense improvement on that presented in what claims to be and is not, the definitive edition of Marlowe.

All in all a book heartily to be commended not only to teachers looking for a text for class room work, but quite as warmly to the general reader.

T. M. PARROTT

*Princeton University*

---

*Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature.* By MEMBERS OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1932. Pp. 231. \$2.50.

The central idea of Mr. Oscar James Campbell's "The Italianate Background of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*" is that the Falstaff of the play was originally a pedant. Passages are quoted in which Falstaff is called by others a scholar. The disguised Brook uses the word and continues on the knight's "war-like, court-like, and learned preparations." It may be remarked that Brook is attempting to get Falstaff's good will, even to the extent of leaving with him a bag of gold; obviously he will hardly spare flattering words, making the fat knight the ideal soldier, courtier, and scholar. Pos-

sibly Brook was supposed to amuse the audience, for he says also: "You are a gentleman of excellent breeding, admirable discourse, of great admittance, authentic in your place and person." Well may Falstaff exclaim "O, sir!"

Of Falstaff's own speeches a number are selected for their learning or pedantry or, as apparently Mr. Campbell would allow to Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, their Euphuism; all these are "unsuited to the fat man of the farce." Our only criterion external to the *Merry Wives* is the language of Falstaff in *Henry IV*, generally admitted as suitable to his character. He makes Biblical references both correct and fitting: Pharaoh's lean kine, Dives in purple, Adam in the state of innocency, Lazarus, the prodigal, and Achitophel. Nor is he ignorant of Diana and Hercules. Twice he alludes to Roman brevity: "I may justly say with the hook-nosed fellow of Rome, 'I came, saw, and overcame'" (Part 2, V. iv. 40; cf. II. ii. 125). Of apoplexy he says: "I have read the cause of his effects in Galen" (I. ii. 118). Logic is known to him as to all well-trained men of the period. Nor is he ignorant of matter suitable for literature, as appears in figures of speech: "I in the clear sky of fame o'ershine you as much as the full moon doth the cinders of the element, which show like pins' heads to her" (Part 2, IV. iii. 50). This is a comic rendering of the Horatian

Micat inter omnes  
Iulium sidus, velut inter ignes  
Luna minores.

Euphuistic in matter is the passage: "Though the camomile, the more it is trodden on the faster it grows, yet youth, the more it is wasted the sooner it wears" (Part 1, II. iv. 408). In comparison with "She discourses, she carves, she gives the leer of invitation" (quoted on p. 88), may be given: "Not to deliberate, not to remember, not to have patience to shift me" (Part 2, V. v. 21). If in the comedy Falstaff complains that "Ignorance itself is a plummet o'er me" (p. 89), in the historical plays he speaks of his "judgment and understanding" (Part 2, I. ii. 8, 195). Nor are further examples of intellectual attainment lacking. Altogether the earlier Falstaff has all the education implied by any of his speeches in the *Merry Wives*.

As to qualities of spirit, has Falstaff's mind "always moved in gay triumph many paces ahead of those who tried to dupe it?" Certainly the prince felt he was successful in duping Falstaff about the robbery, however great the ingenuity or verbal defense. And isn't Falstaff completely unprepared for his rejection by Henry V? But it is not easy to pass by the comic figure of the critics to the real Falstaff.

Intrigue and marital jealousy are commonly called Italianate themes, but if the character of Falstaff is constructed much on the

old pattern need it astonish us that the *Merry Wives* is admired for its representations of English life?

In "Political Aspects of Dryden's *Ambony* and *The Spanish Fryar*," Mr. Louis I. Bredvold ably defends the honor of Dryden. It might be added that the political part of *The Spanish Fryar* is essentially in the tradition of the first half of the century; by its well-worn thoughts no personal application is demanded, no more than when Robert Herrick wrote:

Among disasters that discention brings,  
This not the least is, which belongs to kings.  
If wars go well, each for a part lays claim;  
If ill, then kings, not soldiers, bear the blame.

Cf. the quotations on p. 129.

Likewise one may welcome Mr. Robert W. Babcock's explanation of "Swift's Conversion to the Tory Party." The great satirist has been too long in the hands of enemies. In "The Williams Transcription of *Hellas*" Mr. Bennett Weaver shows Shelley at work on his manuscript. Space permits only a list of the other articles: "Diomed: the Traditional Development of a Character" by Archibald A. Hill; "Some Illustrations of the Mediaeval *gab*" by John R. Reinhard; "The *Paradossi* of Ortensio Lando" by Warner G. Rice; "Some Peculiarities of Shakespearean Texts" (four pages) by Hereward T. Price; "The Conception of Beauty in the works of Shelley, Keats, and Poe" by Solomon F. Gingerich; "Chrétien de Troyes: a Bibliographical Essay" by John R. Reinhard.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

*Duke University*

*Phrasal Patterns in English Prose.* By JOHN HUBERT SCOTT and ZILPHA E. CHANDLER. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1932. Pp. xii + 376. \$4.00.

In this volume two western professors report the results of ten years' study of the rhetorical aspects of the "phrase"—the smallest unit of prose discourse except the word. It is important to observe that they do not use *phrase* in its musical or rhythmic sense, but as a grammatical term. Indeed most of their elaborate analysis is concerned with phrases consisting of a noun with one or more adjectives, a pair of such nouns connected by *and* or *or*, and two such nouns connected by *of*. The esthetic possibilities of these units are the main subject of their study. And though they have thus narrowly limited their area, they make extremely broad claims for their new rhetorical method. It is a "wider rhetoric" for the future, and will equip the young student for the imitation—or, as

they say, the "synthetic duplication"—of the charms of the great prose masters.

It is to be regretted that so much enthusiasm and industry have been devoted to the cultivation of a soil that must in the nature of things remain rhetorically barren. The true unit, or smallest member, in rhetoric is an oral and rhythmic, not a grammatical one, and though it will sometimes be identical with a grammatical phrase, it will just as often not be. The rhetorical terms are *period*, *colon*, and *comma* (sometimes *circuitus*, *membrum*, *submembrum*), terms of oral utterance, not of logical relation; and whether these or other terms are employed, the phenomena they represent are the true subjects of a rhetorical investigation of a formal nature. It is true that popular modern rhetoric fights shy of formalism; but if it should return to it, as the authors of this book would evidently desire, it must return also to the traditional method. (See, for instance, the admirable recent study of rhythm by the French scholar Landry.) There is no art to transmute the baser metals of grammatical analysis to rhetorical gold.

Princeton University

MORRIS W. CROLL

*Pattern and Variation in Poetry.* By CHARD POWERS SMITH.  
New York: Scribners, 1932. Pp. xvi + 408. \$4.50.

The title of this volume might lead one to expect a work of prosody. In fact it is that, but a good deal more too. Mr. Smith believes that the formula "pattern plus variation" describes not only the character of poetic technique, but also the character of all poetic values; and the second part of his book is a study of the esthetic of poetry in terms of this formula. What he means by "pattern" is of course not so obvious in this second part as in the first; yet his excellent art in exposition makes it clear; it is the recognition of something (image, idea, emotion) that one has already known in former experience, the reference back and forth from the new to the known constituting the pattern. This "pattern of recognition," however, does not alone produce the effect of poetry. There must also be a variant from it: a difference which makes the familiar seem as if it had never been before, which makes the commonplace moving and significant. "Imagination, then, is the faculty which perceives the familiar objects of experience in terms of the essential variants which give them an unfamiliar reality" (p. 261). The doctrine seems to derive from Wordsworth and—perhaps more directly—from Shelley. At least it is essentially romantic, and in his illustrations of it Mr. Smith shows himself somewhat blindly prejudiced against the eighteenth century, and in general against poetry in which the imagination works in con-

junction with deliberate intellectual process. He says (p. 351): "With notable exceptions *Paradise Lost* moves in the false world of fancy, rhetoric, and rationalism. Milton was writing mostly with intellectual fury, not with the fervor of things he had experienced"—a hard saying.

Concerning the first half of the book, on technique, not much needs to be said; for the theory is less novel here and more easily applied. There are some metrical discussions that show a great superiority to the mechanical prosodism we are too familiar with. The ear and hand of a practising poet are apparent, for instance, in Mr. Smith's analysis of the rhythm of Meredith's *Dirge in Woods* (pp. 363-4), and in his recognition of the pause (a *rest*, it might properly be called) at the end of trimeter lines as they most commonly occur in English verse. On the other hand, he misquotes occasionally, and more rarely misreads a rhythm, as when he makes a pentameter of the first line of Browning's *Parting at Morning* (p. 367). Many of his analyses, moreover, would be simpler and more acceptable if he had applied consistently the time-principle (which he in fact accepts) instead of relying on the sometimes-unstable accents. It cannot be said too often that stress is a misleading guide in the study of rhythmical pattern.

Princeton University

MORRIS W. CROLL

*The Literary Life of the Early Friends, 1650-1725.* By LUELLA M. WRIGHT. With an Introduction by RUFUS M. JONES. Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. xiv + 312. \$3.00.

*Literature and Education in Early Quakerism.* By LUELLA M. WRIGHT. University of Iowa Studies, Humanistic Studies, V, 2, Feb. 1, 1933. Pp. 60. \$0.50.

Relatively few persons know much about the Quakers. While the facts of Quaker history have received expert attention in recent years by a few savants, publication has not been widespread. Miss Wright's two volumes—one a 309-page book, the other a 60-page monograph—may encourage a somewhat wider knowledge of the inner life of this "peculiar people." Although most of Miss Wright's material is already familiar to the Quaker scholar, it receives fresh signification by the purpose to which she puts it. Her book attempts to explain the motives and methods of literary production by the early Friends. Her monograph, in large part a recapitulation of her book with some additional information respecting the educational equipment of Quaker writers, might be well considered an appended chapter of the first. Four introductory chapters of the *Literary Life* contain an excellent re-statement of

early Quaker history and beliefs—all very readable. Chapter V outlines the literary “principles,” of which the first two relate to the self-conscious plainness of Quaker style, and the third to the emphasis Friends put upon emotional rather than intellectual processes in composition. Thus the Quakers appear to have been as much afraid of adornment in their writing as in their clothes, speech, and furnishings. Avoiding so far as possible the exercise of pure intellect, they indulged in an esoteric escape from the distresses of the times. Chapter VI reveals the methods by which they disseminated their books and tracts over Europe, for they were indefatigable propagandists in this period. Chapter VII discusses the Literature of Suffering, which some readers will think more properly treated if included in Chapter IX, Quaker Histories and Biographies. Chapter VIII points out the rigorous working of Quaker censorship, necessary to preserve the reputation of the Society. Chapter X attempts, somewhat unconvincingly, to find Essays as a type among Quaker writings, though the classification seems a little forced, because of the tractarian nature of the works mentioned. Verse and Allegory, Chapter XI, is also unsatisfying, partly because Friends appear to have been uninspired in poetry and partly because this matter has had some expert handling already.<sup>1</sup> The real meat of the book, however, is found in Chapters XIII to XVII, which discuss very interestingly and discerningly the peculiar qualities of Quaker Journals. Quaker Journals differ from those of other persons by their unique phraseology and their psychological introspection. Because writers of Quaker Journals follow a fixed pattern, their works prove monotonous after the reading of one or two. Further chapters deal respectively and adequately with Religious Confessions, Introspections, and Practical Mysticism. Additional material relating to the education of Quaker writers may be found in the monograph, for, when the public schools and universities were closed to them, as non-conformists, they established their own schools for their children, in which they introduced some practical features in advance of their times.

Both of these books, then, are of value for the purpose they are expected to serve. The facts are clear and the style is readable. The Friendly scholar will find much that is familiar, but the student at large will profit by this new synthesis of Quaker history, thought, methods, and education. One feels, however, that Miss Wright's conclusions are too optimistic. It is interesting to know how and why Quakers wrote as they did, but to pretend that what they wrote is of much value, except to themselves, is asking much. After all, a literature *sans* drama, *sans* fiction, *sans* romance, *sans* everything that spells joy and music and art—circumscribed within

<sup>1</sup> John D. Draper, *The Funeral Elegy and the Rise of Early English Romanticism* (New York, 1929).



the boundaries of sectarian interests and issued mainly as spiritual propaganda—cannot be rated very highly by the “world” it excludes. One also regrets that the author has not taken more careful note of the work already done in this field, to which she makes no reference.

EZRA KEMPTON MAXFIELD

Washington, Pennsylvania

---

*Die Anfänge des Puritanismus, Versuch einer Deutung der Englischen Reformation.* By HERBERT SCHÖFFLER. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1932. Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten XIV. Pp. 177. 5 M.

The history of English puritanism with its manifestations in the middle ages and later is one that opens up a wide and interesting field. But anyone who looks for a treatment of that subject, with perhaps a glance at Montanism, details regarding the Franciscan Spirituals, references to the Cathari, and other movements for the cultivation of poverty or purity of living, will be disappointed in the present study. Precursors of the English Reformation are briefly dealt with, it is true; but far richer discussion in a form no less scholarly may be found in Miss Davison's *The Forerunners of Saint Francis*, or Miss Scudder's *The Franciscan Adventure*. Evaluation of the tendencies appears rather slight, and the interpretation of the significance of a man like Wycliffe is not discriminating. The rest of the monograph is concerned with the Reformation itself.

Of this it gives a smooth and readable account, stressing the political maneuvers which led to a separation of the English Church from Rome. Rightly it traces the spirit of compromise, which played so large a rôle, to the necessities of Henry the Eighth, and the Catholic character of the later period to the tastes of Elizabeth. The schism was a matter of politics and not religion. The reader will find here little about the problem of Apostolic Succession in the English bishopric or about the Black Rubric regarding the nature of the Sacrament. Characteristic observations are the following: “Keine umgeformte Kirche (auch nicht die skandinavischen, welche die Sukzession beibehielten) hat so viel vom kanonischen Gehalt und mittelalterlichen Organisationsgefüge in die neue Zeit hinübergerettet wie die anglikanische. Das ist ein Zeichen, dass der Widerstreit der Kräfte in den entscheidenden frühen Jahren nicht stark war, weil die religiöse Not nicht gross, in weiten Teilen der massgebenden Schicht nicht vorhanden war” (p. 48). “Der König steht zwischen den zwei religiösen Extremen

und entscheidet nach völlig heterogenen Gesichtspunkten—dies ist das Schicksal der englischen Reform,” (p. 82). “Was am 30. Juli 1540 in Smithfield geschah—drei Ketzerrführer verbrannt, drei römisch gesinnte Geistliche wegen Verweigerung des Suprematseid gehängt, zwei von beiden Oppositionen auf derselben Verbrecherschleife zum Richtplatz geschleppt—das war ein symbolisches Vorspiel des Zweifrontenkampfes der englischen Staatskirche, der wohl in Ewigkeit dauern wird” (p. 93). In this last quotation it is noteworthy that the first three were put to death for heresy, the second three—the papists—because of politics. The English reform then was wholly unlike the development of Continental Protestantism, and resembled the formation of the Eastern Churches. In all this survey one finds little that is new, and only a superficial consideration of many important matters.

*Smith College*

HOWARD R. PATCH

*Der Wandel des deutschen Naturgefühls vom 15. zum 18. Jahrhundert.* Von WILLI FLEMMING. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1931. (Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte. Buchreihe 18. Band.)

Mit Flemmings Untersuchung ist eine Grundlage geschaffen für die Einzelforschung, deren das Gebiet in der Zukunft noch bedarf. Er zieht in dieser kurzen, wohl ausgewogenen Arbeit, in der auf jedes der drei Jahrhunderte ungefähr 40 Seiten entfallen, nur die großen Linien, ohne indessen dabei in vages Theoretisieren zu geraten. Im Gegenteil ist jede Behauptung wohl dokumentiert und die Disposition nach den sechs Punkten, Art des Naturgenusses, Stellung des Menschen zur Natur, Deutung der Natur (Natur und Kunst), Erscheinungsform der Natur und Auffassungsweise der Natur, ist in jedem der drei Kapitel wohl innegehalten; auch sind in der Zusammenfassung die gleichen Themen auf Fortschritt und Wesensart hin mit Vorsicht und Klarheit untersucht. Dabei ergibt sich, daß die Verwendung der Natur in der überschaute Zeitspanne bedeutend zunimmt, von einer eigentlichen Entwicklung in gerader Richtung oder nach dem Dreischritt These, Antithese und Synthese jedoch keine Rede sein kann, wohl in erster Linie, weil das Naturgefühl nicht isoliert, sondern mit dem Gesamtkulturbewußtsein verflochten erscheint. Auch stehen schon am Anfang der Zeitspanne so robust empfindende und gestaltende Persönlichkeiten wie Luther und Dürer.

Im 16. Jahrhundert ist eine ausgesprochene Parallelität zwischen Mensch und Natur zu bemerken. Die Natur wird vital genossen, Tier und Gewächs als gleichberechtigte Brüder empfunden, in denen Gottes unmittelbares Wirken zu spüren ist. Im 17.

Jahrhundert spornt das Naturgefühl den aktiven Ichtrieb des Menschen zum Wettkampf und zur Beherrschung. Erde und Himmel müssen an seiner Freude, seinem Leide teilnehmen. Der Barockgarten zeigt den Drang zu Naturbeherrschung und Unterwerfung. In der Landschaftskunst (Elsheimer) wird auffällig das Herunterdrücken des Horizonts und die Diagonaleilung des Bildes in Licht- und Schattendreieck, letzteres gebildet durch einen abfallenden Höhenzug, auf dessen halber Höhe der Betrachtende postiert ist (Landschaft: Heidelberg mit Schloß als Blickpunkt). Im 18. Jahrhundert wird die Natur zur hegenden und schützenden Mutter, der Naturgegenstand wird in seiner Eigengesetzlichkeit verehrt, dem der Mensch in sympathetischem Gefühl verwandt und verbunden ist. Der architektonische Garten verwandelt sich in den Park, dessen Ziel die Herausarbeitung einer idealen Natur ohne Vergewaltigung ihres Wuchses ist, in der im Gegenteil der Mensch ihre eignen Absichten reiner zu verwirklichen strebt. Der Horizont wird wieder in die Höhe gerückt, Wald, Gebüsch schließen den wichtigeren, gestreckten Vordergrund ab. Das Traute, Beruhigende, Lauschige, Umfriedigte, Befriedende wird betont. (Schon bei Goethe trotz Fernsehnsucht wird ja im Werther immer wieder 'Einschränkung' gesucht!)

Es tut dieser Arbeit keinen Abbruch, wenn man genauere Einzeluntersuchungen verlangt. Die starke Richtungsgebung und Vereinfachung war nötig im Gegensatz zu den Materialsammlungen der vielen ziellosen "Naturgefühle bei X, Y, Z," die in ihrer zu großen Begrenzung oft das Typische der Zeit für individuelle Züge hielten. Sicherlich ist auch bei Flemming der Barockbegriff wieder zu einheitlich gesehen. Der Einfluß Hollands ist vermutlich stärker in Norddeutschland. Die ganze niederdeutsche Literatur mit ihrer rationaleren und realistischeren Auffassung bedarf einer eingehenden Studie. Zwischen Rist und Simon Dach bestehen niederdeutsche Bezüge. Sie weisen schon auf die Göttinger vor; und es ist eine interessante Spekulation zu denken, was aus Dach ein Jahrhundert später hätte werden können. Stieler steht zwischen Nord- und Mitteldeutschen, eine kräftige Mischung, Barockmensch mit stark rationalen Elementen. Anderseits weist Spee in seiner franziskanischen Naturliebe eher rückwärts. Ihm sind Wald, Bach und Biene Bruder und Symbol, während Scheffler bekennt: "Ich habe keine Lust an den geschaffnen Dingen." Außerdem beginnt auch im Barock schon die Neigung in der Natur den Lehrmeister zu sehn, während sie noch für Günther auf der einen Seite Argumente für den barocken Drang seines Willens liefert, auf der andern Seite jedoch auch schon den Menschen in ihre Gesetze einschließt, die nicht wider natürlich den erotischen Zwang als Böses zu bezeichnen erlauben.

Im 18. Jahrhundert ist die Sturm- und Drangbewegung mit der

Neigung zum Großartigen, Erhabenen Schaurigen, Melancholischen zu kurz gekommen, wie ja auch die Kritik Goethes in den *Frankfurter Gelehrten Anzeigen* die Beschränkung der Natur auf das Liebliche und Anmutige bei Geßner und Sulzer ablehnt. Doch hätte diese Berücksichtigung die Einheit des Bildes gestört und es wäre vielleicht gerade diese Epoche fruchtbar mit der Romantik zu verbinden.

Besonders fördernd ist bei Flemming die Stützung der Feststellungen auf dem Gebiete der Dichtung durch Heranziehung der Gartenkunst und Landschaftsmalerei, die ihrerseits bei diesem Vergleiche gewinnen.

Es befremdet, daß in einem so wohl dokumentierten und mit praktischen Verweisen versehenen Werke nach deutscher Unart kein Index vorhanden ist.

ERNST FEISE

---

*Von deutscher Dichtung und Musik. Aus den Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Geistes.* Von WILHELM DILTHEY. Mit einer Handschriftenprobe. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1933. xii + 467 pp.

In würdiger Ausstattung, schön gebunden und auf blütenweißem Papier bringt der Verlag hier, herausgegeben von Hermann Nohl und Georg Misch, Bruchstücke eines umfassenden Werkes, das den Titel „Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Geistes“ tragen sollte und an dem Dilthey in den Jahren von 1904-1908, also als über Siebenzigjähriger arbeitete. Die einzelnen Abhandlungen, zwar in verschiedenen Stadien der Vollendung, lassen doch die große Linie des ursprünglichen Planes erkennen: die nationale Eigenart des deutschen Geistes herauszuarbeiten, wie er in Wechselwirkung mit der allgemeinen europäischen Entwicklung nimmt und gibt, sich wandelt, ohne die Grundzüge zu verleugnen, Wurzelgrund seiner Gestalter ist, die nun ihrerseits ihrer Zeit und ihrer Art gemäß daran weiterbilden; eine große Konzeption, die in ihrer Einstellung auf das Gemein-germanische an Herder erinnert.

Der erste Aufsatz, *Die germanische Welt*, der vielleicht in der Darstellung der schönsten weil abgerundetste ist, wird an Bedeutung von dem zweiten, *Die ritterliche Dichtung und das nationale Epos*, übertroffen, in dem die Kontrastierung der drei Epiker, Hartmann, Wolfram und Gottfried, in der Darstellung der gedanklichen Größe und Originalität des *Parzival* gipfelt mit seinem Ziel: Wirken der christlichen Religiosität im weltlichen Leben. Die Behandlung des *Nibelungenliedes* (geschrieben vor Heuslers unübertrefflicher Untersuchung!) leidet zwar an der Annahme der Lachmannschen Liedertheorie, erfährt indessen trotzdem eine schöne ethische und ästhetische Würdigung. Eine Frage, die sich

mir hier aufdrängt, ist die, ob es "wirklich in keine Bewegung des 12. oder 13. Jahrhunderts eingriff," oder ob nicht doch der Begriff Treue (die sich hier rein auf die Sippe beschränkt und auf das Mannenverhältnis) an dem Begriff der höheren Menschlichkeit der ritterlich-höfischen Auffassung (wie sie im *Parzival* auftritt und auch von Dietrich von Bern verkörpert erscheint) gemessen wird.

In der *Großen deutschen Musik des 18. Jahrhunderts* erhalten besonders Bach und Mozart eine ausgedehnte und glänzende Charakterisierung. In *Klopstock* wird die Heiligung des Gefühls dargestellt, und der große Schilleraufsatz gipfelt in der Betrachtung des *Wallenstein*, der, wie Dilthey meint, noch "nie so aufgeführt worden ist, wie Schiller ihn intentioniert hat" und der "philosophischer als die Philosophie" und "historischer als die Geschichte" ist. Das Königlich-heroische arbeitet er am Charakter des Helden besonders heraus und weist (übrigens durchaus im Sinne von Ludwigs *Shakespearestudien*) auf die "Masken" Wallensteins, die verschiedenen Gesichter verschiedenen Menschen gegenüber.

Die kleine Welt des Philisters stellt der Aufsatz über *Jean Paul* auch dem rein gedanklich und dichterisch Heroischen der deutschen Klassik gegenüber, denn diese kleine Welt der Nester gehört gleichfalls zum Bilde der nationalen Eigenart. Ob Dilthey diese Welt des Philisteriums (die dann nach Jean Paul von Raabe heroisiert wird) als spezifisch und notwendig deutsch empfindet, wird nicht klar. Er ist im Großen und Ganzen in seiner Abstraktion nationaler Züge vorsichtig und zeigt, daß aus dem Zettel des Irrational-Bleibenden und dem Einschlag des Rational-Fortschreitenden erst die Webe mit wechselnden Linien und Farben entsteht. Gerade heute, wo der Betrieb in voller Blüte steht, rein in Stadien der Entwicklung bedingte nationale Züge als vorbildlich hinzustellen, so willkürlich Organisch-Gewordenes ganzer Epochen der nationalen Entfaltung auszuschalten und den Blick rückwärts statt vorwärts zu richten, muß dies besonders betont werden. Mißbraucht, würde dies Buch der "Gleichschaltung" wertvolle Argumente liefern können.

Dem Verlage sowie den Herausgebern gebührt unser Dank für dies weitere Stück des wertvollen Diltheyschen Nachlasses.

ERNST FEISE

---

*Die Klangmalerei bei Harsdörffer.* Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Literatur, Poetik und Sprachtheorie der Barockzeit. Von WOLFGANG KAYSER. (= Palaestra 179) Leipzig: Mayer und Müller, 1932. vii + 288 pp. Mk. 17.20.

In zwei theoretischen Kapiteln klärt Kayser das Problem: er scheidet Lautmalerei sinnfreier Ausdrücke (brekekekex), Laut-

symbolik (Verlebendigung eines akustischen Eindrucks ohne ein für allemal feststehenden Lautwert—*quamquam sint sub aqua . . .*) und Klangfarbe (ohne sinnlich faßbare konkrete Beziehung auf nachzuahmende Laute); er weist nach, daß im Barock die Formgattung (didaktische Prosa, knapp erzählende Prosa, Gelegenheitsgedicht, Schäfergedicht etc.) ihren der individuellen Ausdrucksgebung übergeordneten Zwang übt, daher Lautmalerei in gewissen Gattungen vom Autor gebraucht, in andern nicht angewendet wird. Diese Feststellung des Gattungszwanges ist fraglos wichtig und von Tragweite über das in Frage stehende Problem sowohl wie über das besprochene Individuum und seine Zeit hinaus. Im Barock besonders aber hat sie ihre Bedeutung, weil hier die Einstellung des Autors weitgehend argumentativ-rhetorisch ist, was z. B. die vielen völlig entgegengesetzten Palinodien (Lob Christi—Lob des Dionysos; Lob des Krieges—Lob des Friedens) erklärt.

Nach dieser Scheidung wird Harsdörffers Gebrauch der Klangmalerei als weit ausgedehnt, als bahnbrechend für einen neuen Stil und als gattungsgebunden charakterisiert. Sie hat ihre Grundlage nicht so sehr in seiner Stiltheorie, sondern in seiner Sprachtheorie, nach der die deutsche Sprache, als älteste nach der hebräischen, als fähig erwiesen wird, "mit den Zungen der Natur zu reden, indem sie alles Getön und was nur einen Laut, Hall oder Schall von sich gibt, wohlvernehmlich ausdrückt." Dabei ergibt sich, daß H. Argumente der *ψύσει*- und *θέσει*-theorien je nach Bedarf anwendet, von Böhmcs Sprachmystik (gegen Hankamers Annahme) aber unberührt bleibt.

Die hier gelöste Aufgabe wird von einem ungeheuren Apparat von Rhetoriken, Poetiken und Sprachtheorien von Plato bis Schottel, die der Verfasser durchgearbeitet hat und mit scharfem Unterscheidungsvermögen diskutiert, beinahe erdrückt. Außerdem wird die deutsche Literatur von 1500 an bis auf H. selbst mit diesem kontrastiert als anregungslos, die fremdsprachliche als richtunggebend erwiesen in der Rangordnung: italienisch, neulateinisch, französisch, spanisch, holländisch, englisch. Ein Schlußkapitel diskutiert die außerordentliche Einwirkung Harsdörffers und die Weite seiner persönlichen Beziehungen.

Es wäre zu wünschen gewesen, daß der Verfasser durch Listen gebrauchter Klangworte seine gründliche Arbeit auch für weitere Untersuchungen auf diesem Gebiete nutzbar gemacht hätte. Auch intensive Betrachtung derselben in bezug auf Versmaß und Melodie dürfte förderlich sein selbst bei negativen Resultaten. Ferner wäre bei H. s Kenntnis der deutschen Literatur ein Hinausgehen über das Jahr 1500 doch nicht ganz ausgeschlossen. Doch das sind Idealforderungen, die in Hinblick auf die erstaunliche Arbeit, die hier in der Bewältigung von Fachliteratur einerseits, von viel-

sprachigem Material anderseits geleistet worden ist, fast undankbar erscheinen.

Ein Vorwort betont den Zusammenhang der Studie mit Petersens Barockseminar und ein vollständiges Namenregister erfreut das Herz des Besprechers.

ERNST FEISE

*Théophile de Viau: Pyrame et Thisbé.* Publié par J. HANKISS.  
Strasbourg: Heitz, 1933. Pp. 137 (Singulæria, Collection de  
textes rares et précieux, Vol. I).

It is a pleasure to welcome this new collection of rare texts, published under the learned direction of Professors Hankiss of Debrecen, Hoepffner and Schneegans of Strasbourg, and Vossler of Munich, who inaugurate the series with this excellent critical edition of *Pyrame et Thisbé* by M. Hankiss. Though frequently memorized in the generation that followed its first publication in 1623, often republished during the seventeenth century, ridiculed by Boileau, praised by Théophile Gautier and Remy de Gourmont, the tragedy had become difficult of access, as the Alleaume edition is now out of print and no one had made, before M. Hankiss, a critical edition of it. He takes as the basis of his text the last edition published during the author's lifetime and adds variants from the editions of Scudéry and Alleaume. In an interesting introduction and ample notes he gives the necessary information for an understanding of the text, its sources, literary relations, and influence. He shows a just appreciation of both the fine qualities and the absurdities of this celebrated tragedy, whose faulty structure and extraordinary examples of affectation and misplaced cleverness have made many readers overlook Théophile's passion, his pathos, and his love of nature. The following notes correct a few minor errors and suggest a few additions:

P. 10, Boisrobert, not Scudéry, wrote the *Couronnement de Darie*. P. 15, note, l. 8, for *tho*, read *two*. P. 22, I still see no reason for assigning *Pasiphaë* to Théophile, for the evidence derived from Garasse's silence and from Colletet seems to me much stronger than the statement of the nameless acquaintance of an untrustworthy publisher. P. 51, the second speech is Pyrame's; v. 391 is, through a printer's blunder, the same as v. 392; the former should read "Vous arrivez plus tard que je ne fis hier." P. 86, v. 1103 has one syllable too many; omit *me*. Pp. 100, 114, it would be well to note that Esprit Aubert's additions to the text are made in order to keep the rule for *alternance*. P. 106, v. 376 is closely imitated by Du Ryer in his *Arétaphile*, III, 2. P. 109, v. 506 is repeated *verbatim* by Provais in his *Innocent exilé*, II, 4. Pp. 120-4, the *préciosité* of the last act was criticised, long before Boileau wrote, by Dalibray in the preface to his *Aminte*, published in 1632.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

*A Graded Spanish Review Grammar with Composition.* By F. COURTNEY TARR and AUGUSTO CENTENO. New York: Crofts & Co., 1933. Pp. xii + 321.

El título, a causa de su sabor comercial, hace temer que esta gramática sea otra de tantas, pero basta abrirla por una página cualquiera para convencerse de lo contrario. Los autores han escrito un verdadero tratado de sintaxis, claro, metódico y original.

Por la novedad de la exposición y por la exactitud de las conclusiones, se destacan los párrafos referentes a la cuestión de *ser* y *estar*, la discusión general del relativo y el análisis de la voz pasiva. Los capítulos dedicados al adjetivo y al artículo demuestran que, apartándose de la rutina, se llega a menudo por el camino más corto a la solución más aceptable. En general puede decirse que no hay problema difícil para el cual no se haya encontrado una regla fácil y un ejemplo oportuno.

Sin duda por economizar palabras los Sres T. y C. emplean en todo el libro un estilo demasiado categórico que a veces les hace caer en ligeras inexactitudes. Por ejemplo, al tratar del género de los nombres (§165) sería mejor decir que los terminados en *ad*, *ud*, *ie*, *ión* y *umbre* son femeninos *solamente cuando* tienen significación abstracta o colectiva, porque así nadie se acordaría de *abad*, *ataúd*, *laúd*, *vislumbre*, *azumbre*, *gorrión*, *escorpión*, *sarampión* y otros varios que no entran en la regla. Quizá por la misma razón, por el deseo de abreviar, se encuentran aquí y allá ciertas afirmaciones que pecan de terminantes. Para mí es tan dudoso que *dos* se use menos que *cuatro* con valor indefinido (§ 209) como que las interjecciones sean más frecuentes en español que en inglés (§ 102), y no lo creo mientras no me lo demuestren con estadísticas.

El uso del infinitivo como nombre, especialmente característico del estilo poético según el § 107, necesitaría explicarse mejor. Cualquiera puede decir *el patinar de las ruedas* sin miedo a que le tomen por poeta. En mi opinión, lo que sucede es que cuando no existe el sustantivo correspondiente se recurre con frecuencia al infinitivo, y de ahí vienen *el piafar de los caballos*, *el serpear de la vía* y ahora *mi argüir*.

Tampoco estoy muy conforme con los autores en lo que dicen sobre las diversas abreviaciones de *usted*, cada día menos usadas; sobre los nombres de los meses, que si alguna vez se escriben con mayúscula es en las fechas pero casi nunca en los demás casos; sobre los sufijos aumentativos y diminutivos, cuya función no me parece suficientemente aclarada; y sobre algún otro punto de la analogía, la cual evidentemente les ha interesado menos que la sintaxis.

Entre las omisiones recuerdo un presente de indicativo que no tiene traducción literal en inglés—*el cuchillo corta*—y *Santiago, patrón de España*, excepción importante que debió incluirse al tratar de los adjetivos apocopados.



Las precedentes observaciones las hago por si alguna de ellas merece ser tomada en cuenta para otra edición, y no por ganas de enmendar la plana, que en este caso tiene realmente muy poco que enmendar.

JOSÉ ROBLES

---

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*La Mystique de Baudelaire*, by JEAN POMMIER (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1932), traces the origins of the symbolistic elements of the sonnet, *Les Correspondances*. Baudelaire's *Salons* (1845-1846) exhibit the poet's use of musical terms to describe color, and parallel notations would tend to date the sonnet. The poet had already experienced the synaesthesia produced by hasheesh, and the confirmation of his sensations found in the works of Hoffmann excited this tendency. More original is the chapter on the influence of G. de Nerval and his *Vers dorés*. Scholars not mentioned here have indicated the influence of Swedenborg, who as a mystic gave B. much more than certain details of the sonnet and its title. But new and important is the chapter on Lavater and the discussions of Fourier's influence and Toussenel's. The symbolism of flowers, animals, and "des choses muettes" is studied; a "philosophie de la rhétorique" introduces a chapter on B's comparisons and metaphors. Allegories, and the allegorical tendency in B., which increased until it became almost mythopoeic, are then taken up: B., like Swedenborg, viewed the world as an analogy, and if his system was not complete, it was more fertile for his followers because it was intuitive. A valuable, but by no means definitive study, since it omits the obvious influence of figures like Plotinus and Cousin. No consideration is given to the work of any American scholar; a panegyric of a compatriot is followed on the same page by a confession of inability to consult a book so important as Babbitt's *New Laokoon*, now in its sixth edition and published also in England.

L. P. SHANKS

---

*Gerhart Hauptmann*, von E. SULGER-GEHING. Vierte verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage, bearbeitet von DR. WALTHER LINDEN. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1932. Since the last edition of this reliable and succinct account of Gerhart Hauptmann's work ten years have lapsed, and it was the task of Walther Linden to bring it up to date for the occasion of the seventieth birthday of the dramatist. He adds in the seventh chapter characterizations of

*Veland*, *Dorothea Angermann*, and the smaller plays; in the eighth chapter summaries and valuations of *Phantom* ("formal vollendetes Einzelwerk"), *Insel der großen Mutter* ("romantisch schlechthin meisterhafte Altersschau des allumfassenden Eros"), and of the pathological story *Wanda* ("naturalistischer Rückschlag"). *Till Eulenspiegel* is counted among the best creations of the poet, although its flight of ideas does not lift it above the troubled world of after-war times and does not actively point to new aims.

The concluding chapter in a brief survey of Hauptmann's work emphasizes the strong independence of its growth and character and the poet's belief in a strict determinism.

The bibliography should have included Julius Bab's work, especially his chapter in Arnold's *Deutsches Drama*.

ERNST FEISE

*Soziale Lyrik in England 1880-1914.* By EVA WALRAF. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1932. Pp. 108. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, xxiv.) M. 5. Dr. Walraf discusses not the social lyric in England but the main ideas of six writers of social verse, Morris, Davidson, Binyon, Phillips, Hueffer, and Gibson. She limits herself to the well known, drawing material largely from the most obvious sources. She apologizes for whatever originality she offers on Binyon, Phillips, Hueffer and Gibson, "da es noch keine umfassenderen kritischen Studien über die genannten Dichter gibt." She does not survey the extent of the social lyric during the period nor estimate the influence of the men studied. The brochure will be of use only to German students who do not read English easily.

GORDON H. HARPER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

*Dämon Faust.* By Dr. HERMANN AMMON. Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmlers Verlag, 1932. Pp. 344. This learned and interesting critic attacks the problems of *Faust* with no lack of self-confidence, announcing very simply that he has solved them: *Faust* represents the development of Faustian, i. e. German culture, symbolized by the "Dämon Faust". Difficulties that others see are "Hirngespinnste von Philologen, die das Wesen nicht zu schauen vermögen". It is very fascinating to follow his comments on the drama, all centering about the conception "dämonisch" which Goethe defined in the *Conversations with Eckermann* as that which cannot be defined by mind or reason. Yet one cannot but feel that by confining himself to this catchword of modern German criticism Dr.

Ammon fails ever to see in Faust the representative of the common human lot and also makes many statements that appear quite forced, as, for example, when Gretchen becomes "das dämonische Weib".

A. E. ZUCKER

---

*Richard Wagner in der französischen Literatur; zweiter Teil: die Prosa.* By KURT JÄCKEL. Breslau: Priebatsch Buchhandlung, 1932. Pp. 319. *Nachklänge Richard Wagners im Roman.* By ANNA JACOBSON. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1932. Pp. 134. These two works are complementary, Jäckel deals with the treatment of Wagner and Wagnerian themes in French prose, especially the novel (in a previously published volume he deals with French poets), while Jacobson covers in a similar manner the German, English, and American novel, with some references also to D'Annunzio, Strindberg, and some Russians. The subject-matter is surprisingly extensive; indeed it would be difficult to think of any other character in the nineteenth century, with the possible exception of Napoleon, who had furnished more material for the novelists of the entire Western world than did the genius of Bayreuth. The great heat with which the subject is treated, pro and con, even in very recent novels, shows that "der Kampf um Wagner" is by no means a thing of the past; in the German novel the situation is complicated considerably by the fact that Wagner was anti-Semitic.

A. E. ZUCKER

---

*Goethe's Knowledge of English Literature.* By JAMES BOYD. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. 310. \$4.50. The importance of the subject covered by this scholarly study can be gauged by the words with which Mr. Boyd begins the chapter on Byron: "In Goethe's life there were three distinct periods, during which he was influenced by three great contemporaries—Herder, Schiller, and Byron. Of these three periods the first and the last were essentially English." The author devotes 78 pages to Shakespeare, 64 to Byron, and 59 to Scott and Carlyle, in addition to mentioning, of course, dozens of other writers, including the Americans Cooper and Irving. The book is an amazing record of Goethe's vast interest in English letters from his first boyish efforts to master the language to his close relationship with British authors in his old age. The Reader in German in the University of Oxford could not have contributed a more fitting gift to the Goethe Centenary.

A. E. ZUCKER

*University of Maryland*

*Christina Rossetti, a Study.* By FREDGOND SHOVE. New York: Macmillan, 1931. Pp. xvi + 120. \$2.00. This little anniversary volume is a mellow and temperate appreciation of Christina Rossetti's poetry. It affords no new information to the scholar. But the critic may find some novelty of opinion in its preference for Goblin Market over the more popular religious lyrics.

EDWIN B. BURGUM

*New York University*

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

VALENTINE AND ORSON. The question at issue between Mr. Krappe (*MLN.*, XLVIII, 485) and myself is not, as he seems to believe, whether this folk-tale which happens to have been recorded early, or this other folk-tale which is recorded only later, is the source of *Valentine and Orson*. Were this the question, I should not be justified in trespassing further on your space. But the question is, am I correct in proposing, for the central story of this late and composite romance, a lineage which takes into account the well known and earlier medieval stories of similar kind, or is Mr. Krappe correct in proposing for it a lineage which ignores this vast body of extant and similar stories? And back of this is the larger question, whether or not a work of literature is to be interpreted in the light of its literary background? I have examined, in the case of *Valentine and Orson*, the stories which constitute this background, and have proposed certain relationships. Mr. Krappe promises to take up the stories one by one in later years. I look forward to the results of these researches, but meanwhile, I do not ask him to take up the stories one by one, I ask him to look at the whole group of stories and say whether he supposes that the writer of each had never heard of any of the others? And he himself supplies the answer when he refers me to his article in *Nuovi Studi Medievali*, III, 223 ff., wherein I seem to find, on page 253, that certain medieval romances, including *Valentine and Orson*, listed on pages 227-28, are dependent upon the Eustace legend. Well then, just what in *Valentine and Orson* may have come from *Eustace*, what from *Octavian*, what from each of the others? The answers which I have proposed, Mr. Krappe now wishes to reject without examination, because he has found a North American folk-tale. This is the issue, which Mr. Krappe's latest communication tends rather to becloud than to make clear.

ARTHUR DICKSON

*College of the City of New York*

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Allen, Robert J.—The Clubs of Augustan London. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xii + 306. \$3.00. (Harvard Studies in English, VII.)

Caldwell, James Ralston.—Eger and Grime: A parallel-text edition of the Percy and the Huntington-Laing Versions of the Romance, with an Introductory Study. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. 354. \$3.50. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, IX.)

Cunningham, Robert Newton. — Peter Anthony Motteux, 1663-1718. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1933. Pp. x + 218. 8 s. 6 d.

Eliot, T. S.—The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism: Studies in the Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. x + 150. \$2.00. (Charles Eliot Norton Lectures for 1932-3.)

Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature (Volume XV), ed. Maynadier, Hawkins, and Burkhard. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. 370.

Hatfield, James Taft.—New Light on Longfellow: with Special Reference to his Relations to Germany. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1933. Pp. x + 188. \$2.75.

Krebs, Karl.—Der Bedeutung von ME. Clerk und damit zusammenhängende Probleme: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Soziologie der Englischen Bildung im ausgehenden Mittelalter. *Bonn*: Peter Hanstein, 1933. Pp. 162. M. 6.80. (Bonner Studien zur Englischen Philologie, XXI.)

McKerrow, Ronald B.—The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors, 1709-1768. *London*: Milford, 1933. Pp. 36. \$0.65. (Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, Proceedings, XIX.)

Partridge, Eric.—Words, Words, Words! *London*: Methuen, 1933. Pp. x + 230. 6 s.

Stewart, George R.—A Bibliography of the Writings of Bret Harte in the Magazines and Newspapers of California, 1857-1871. *Berkeley*: University of California Press, 1933. Pp. 56. \$0.50. (University of California Publications in English, III, 119-170.)

Studies in English (Number 13) *Austin*: University of Texas, 1933. Pp. 138. \$1.00. (University of Texas Bulletin, 3326.)

Taylor, Walt.—Arabic Words in English. *London*: Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. 567-

University of Edinburgh English Department.—Edinburgh Essays on Scots Literature. Preface by H. J. C. Grierson. *Edinburgh*: Oliver and Boyd, 1933. Pp. xii + 174. 5 s.

Trounce, A. McL.—Athelston, a Middle English Romance. *London*: Humphrey Milford, 1933. Pp. viii + 158. 6 s. (Publications of the Philological Society, XI.)

Withington, Robert (ed.).—Essays and Characters: Lamb to Thompson. *New York*: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. xxviii + 778. \$2.75.

—Essays and Characters: Montaigne to Goldsmith. *New York*: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. xxvi + 622. \$2.25.

## GERMAN

Amrhein, August.—Die Walter von der Vogelweide-Legende. [= Amrhein: Magister Heinrich Poeta. Nachtrag] *Würzburg*: Bauch [1933]. 16 pp. 40 Pf.

Baerg, Gerhard.—Alternate German Grammar Review with Composition. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1933. viii, 236 pp. \$1.50.

Becker, Horst.—Mundart und Geschichte im Osterzegebirge. [Mitteldeutsche Studien. H. 4 = Teuthonista. Beiheft 6]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. 63 pp., 12 plates. M. 5.

Bergmann, Conrad Arnold.—Walther von der Vogelweide. Lehrer und Führer des deutschen Volkes. *Freiburg*: Herder, 1933. viii, 96 pp. M. 1.80.

Bonnemann, Elsbeth.—Lessingkritik und Lessingbild der Romantik. *Diss. Köln*: 1932. v, 141 pp.

Breyer, Herbert.—Das Prinzip von Form und Sinn im Drama Zacharias Werners. [Sprache und Kultur der germ. u. roman. Völker. B. Bd. 4]. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1933. 243 pp. M. 8.

Burkart, Carl Josef.—Die Bühnenbearbeitungen des Don Carlos von Schiller (Jambenfassung). *Diss. Heidelberg*. *Bruchsal*: Kruse, 1933. 54 pp. M. 2.

Engel, Pepi.—Der dramatische Vortrieb in Goethes "Torquato Tasso." [Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur Bd. 33]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. 101 pp., 2 plates. M. 3.60.

Festschrift, Theodor Siebs zum 70. Geburtstag, 26. Aug. 1932, hrsg. von Walther Steller [Germanistische Abhandlungen, H. 67]. *Breslau*: Marcus, 1933. xvi, 489 pp. M. 25.

Festschrift zum 200. Geburtstag des Dichters Christoph Martin Wieland, geb. 5. Sept. 1933. Hrsg. von der Stadtgemeinde u. dem Kunst- u. Altertumsverein. *Biberach/Riss*: Dornsche Buchhandlung, 1933. 200,

**Filzeck, Karl.**—Metaphorische Bildungen im älteren deutschen Fastnachtspiel. Diss. Köln. *Würzburg: Triltsch, 1933.* vi, 67 pp.

**Gerster, Matthäus.**—Sebastian Sailer, der Vater der schwäbischen Dialektdichtung. [Aus Schwabens Vergangenheit. Nr. 13]. *Stuttgart: Kepplerhaus [1933].* 32 pp. 25 Pf.

**Glafz, Emil.**—Psychologie und Weltanschauung in Gerhart Hauptmanns "Fuhrmann Henschel." Ein Beitrag zur Wesenskenntnis Hauptmanns. Diss. Erlangen. *Emsdetten: Lechte, 1933.* viii, 96 pp. M. 3.

**Greyerz, Otto von.**—Sprache, Dichtung, Heimat. Studien, Aufsätze und Vorträge über Sprache und Schrifttum der deutschen Schweiz und der östlichen deutschen Alpenländer. *Bern: Francke, 1933.* 423 pp. M. 16.

**Grimm, Jakob.**—Nachtrag zum Briefwechsel zwischen Jakob Grimm und Jos. von Lassberg. Mit Erl. hrsg. von Karl Schulte-Kemminghausen [Aus: Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1933, 16]. *Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933.* 36 pp. M. 3.50.

**Humpf, Hans.**—Das Weltbild in den Novellen und Dramen von Paul Ernst. *München: Hueber, 1933.* 55 pp. M. 2.

**Huth, Carl.**—Zur Dichtung Friedrich Leopold Stolberg. Untersuchungen an dem utopischen Mischwerk "Die Insel." Diss. Greifswald. *St. Tönis: Küppers, 1933.* 77 pp.

**Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft.** Im Auftrag des Vorstandes hrsg. von Max Hecker. Bd. 19. *Weimar: Goethe-Ges., 1933.* 276 pp. 2 plates.

**Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur.** Hrsg. von der Literaturarchiv-Ges. in Berlin. [N. F. Bd. 10] Bibliographie 1930. *Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933.* 320 pp. M. 20.

**Jirát, Vojtěch.**—Platens Stil. Ein Beitrag zum Stilproblem der nachromantischen Lyrik. [Facultas philosophica Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis. *Práce z vědeckých útavů.* 32.] *Prag: Rivnáč, 1933.* vii, 156 pp. Kč 27.

**Kander, Lotte.**—Die deutsche Ruinenpoesie des 18. Jhs. bis in die Anfänge des 19. Jhs. Diss. *Heidelberg: 1933.* 107 pp.

**Kretschmann, Herbert.**—Der Stil Frauenlobs. [Jenaer germanistische Forschungen. 23]. *Jena: Frommann, 1933.* 281 pp. M. 12.50.

**Krogmann, Willy.**—Das Arminiusmotiv in der deutschen Dichtung. Rede. *Wismar: Hinstorff, 1933.* 20 pp. M. 1.

—Der Name der Germanen. *Wismar:*

**Langbroek, Maarten.**—Liebe und Freundschaft bei Klopstock und im niederländischen empfindsamen Roman. Diss. Amsterdam. *Purmerend: J. Muusses, 1933.* xii, 216 pp. Fl. 3.50.

**Langer, Lotte.**—Komik und Humor bei Gerhart Hauptmann. Diss. *Kiel: 1932.* 95 pp.

**Löfstedt, Ernst.**—Beiträge zur nordfriesischen Mundartenforschung. [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1, bd. 29, nr. 2]. *Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1933.* 98 pp. M. 5.50.

**Lüdtke, Ernst.**—Vom Wesen deutscher und französischer Klassik. Versuch einer Stildeutung an Goethes "Iphigenie" und Racines "Mithridate." *Stettin: Ostsee-Verlag, 1933.* 27 pp. 90 Pf.

**Mader, Ignaz.**—Die Ortsnamen der Pfarrgemeinde Natz bei Brixen mit siedlungsgeschichtlichen Bemerkungen. [Schlern-Schriften. 22]. *Innsbruck: Wagner, 1933.* 127 pp. M. 5.

**Müller, Karl Fr.**—Die literarische Kritik in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung und ihr Wesen. [Deutsche Forschungen. Bd. 26]. *Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg, 1933.* 116 pp. M. 3.80.

**Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch.** Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung. Jg. 58/59. 1932/33. *Hamburg: Wachholtz, 1933.* 179 pp. M. 8.

**Notkers des Deutschen Werke.** Nach den Hss. hrsg. von E. H. Sehrdt und Taylor Starck. Ersten Bandes zweites Heft: Boethius de consolatione philosophiae, III. [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek Nr. 33]. *Halle: Niemeyer, 1933.* Pp. 137-244. M. 3.60.

**Novellen, Mittelhochdeutsche.** II. Rittertreue. Schlegel. Hrsg. von Ludwig Pfannmüller. Unveränderter Neudruck. [Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen. 95]. *Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933.* 63 pp. M. 2.

**Olzien, Otto Heinrich.**—Der Satzbau in "Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre." Eine sprachstilistische Untersuchung. [Von deutscher Poeterey. Bd. 14]. *Leipzig: J. J. Weber, 1933.* 86 pp. M. 5.50.

**Pahl, Günter.**—R. M. Rilke. *Berlin: Goldstein, 1933.* 80 pp. M. 2.

**Palmer, Philip M.**—Der Einfluss der neuen Welt auf den deutschen Wortschatz 1492-1800. [Germanische Bibliothek. Abt. 2, Bd. 35]. *Heidelberg: Winter, 1933.* 166 pp. M. 7.50.

**Pfeiffer, Emilie.**—Shakespeares und Tiecks Märchendramen. [Mnemosyne. H. 13]. *Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1933.* 84 pp. M. 3.50.

**Pletschette, N.**—Biller aus der Letzeburger Spröch. Riedensarten a Wirder. *Luxemburg:*

**Raab, Karl.**—Annette von Droste-Hülshoff im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Kritik. *Münster*: Regensburg, 1933. 147 pp. M. 3.

**Rohrmann, Willibald.**—Die Anfänge der literarischen Kritik in Schlesien. Diss. *Breslau*: Schles. Volkszeitung, 1933. 110 pp.

**Rosenthal, B.**—Der Geniebegriff des Aufklärungszeitalters (Lessing und die Popularphilosophen). [Germanische Studien. H. 138]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 215 pp. M. 8.40.

**Schæder, Grete, und Schæder, Hans Heinrich.**—Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Bd. 1: Die Gestalten von Dr. Grete Schæder. [Neue Forschung. 21, 1]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1933. 197 pp. M. 8.

**Schneider, Hermann.**—Vom Wallenstein zum Demetrius. Untersuchungen zur stilgeschichtlichen Stellung und Entwicklung von Schillers Drama. [Tübinger germanistische Arbeiten. Bd. 18]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1933. vi, 104 pp. M. 7.50.

**Scholz, Adolf.**—Deutsche Mundarten-Wörterbücher. Versuch einer Darstellung ihres systematisch-historischen Werdegangs von Anbeginn bis zum Ende des 18. Jhs. Diss. Greifswald. [Form und Geist, Bd. 30]. *Leipzig*: Eichblatt, 1933. ix, 84 pp. M. 5.

**Schröder, Ernst.**—Die Pfarrerstochter von Taubenhain. Stoff- und motivgeschichtliche Studien zur Volkskunde und Literaturwissenschaft. Diss. *Kiel*: Schmidt & Klannig, 1933. 85 pp.

**Schubert, Johann David.**—Die Wertherillustrationen des Joh. David Schubert. Mit einer Einl. von Wolfgang Pfeiffer [Schriften der Goethe-Ges. Bd. 46]. *Weimar*: Goethe-Ges. 1933. 15 pp., 14 plates.

**Soltan, Jens.**—Die Sprache im Drama. [Germanische Studien. H. 139]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 126 pp. M. 5.

**Thomas, Anneliese.**—Don Carlos und Hamlet. [Mnemosyne. H. 15]. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. 120 pp. M. 5.25.

**Treske, Erika.**—Der Rosenkruzerroman "Le Comte de Gabalis" und die geistigen Strömungen des 17. u. 18. Jhs. Diss. Greifswald, 1932. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 66 pp.

**Wächter, Reinhold.**—Anastasius Grüns politische Dichtung. Geistesgeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchung. [Jenaer germanistische Forschungen. Bd. 24]. *Jena*: Frommann, 1933. xviii, 145 pp. M. 7.

**Welter, Wilhelm.**—Die niederfränkischen Mundarten im Nordosten der Provinz Lüttich [Noord- en Zuid-Nederlandsche Dialectbibliotheek. Deel 4]. *Haag*: Nijhoff, 1933. xviii, 205 pp. Fl. 6.

**Wiegand, Eduard.**—Die Weltanschauung des reifen Raabe. Diss. *Münster*: Hansa-

**Wildstake, Karl.**—Wielands Agathon und der französische Reise- und Bildungsroman von Fénelons Telemach bis Barthélemy's Anacharsis. Diss. *München*. *Murnau*: Fürst, 1933. 70 pp.

**Wrede, Ferdinand.**—Von Wenker zu Wrede. Dem Herausgeber des "Deutschen Sprachatlas" Ferdinand Wrede zum 70. Geburtstag von seinen Marburger Mitarbeitern. [Deutsche Dialektgeographie. H. 21]. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1933. 82 pp. M. 6.

**Zimmermann, Irene.**—Lesartenstudie zur Lyrik der Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Diss. *Köln*. *Worms*: Kranzbühler, 1933. 196 ff.

## FRENCH

**Ahting, G.**—Henri Alain-Fournier (1886-1914). Diss. *Bonn*: 1932. 94 + ix pp.

**Barthold, A. J.**—Student's practical manual of Fr. pronunciation. *New York*: Harper, 1933. viii + 128 pp. \$0.75.

**Bellows, J.**—Dict. for the pocket. Fr. and Eng. *Paris*: Hachette, 1930. 607 pp.

**Bronckart, M.**—Etude philolog. sur la langue, le vocab. et le style du chroniqueur Jean de Haynin. *Brussels*: Palais des Académies, 1933. 306 pp.

**Brummer, R.**—Studien zur franz. Aufklärungsliteratur im Anschluss an J.-A. Naigeon. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1933. viii + 338 pp.

**Bürzle, A.**—Beiträge zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der franz. stammbastufenden Verben im 16. Jh. aus Texten und Grammatiken. Diss. *Munich*: 1933. 192 pp.

**Carli, A. De.**—En relisant Zola. *Turin*: Chiantore, 1933. vi + 211 pp.

**Chankin, V. and Schwartz, I. A.**—A new approach to composition in Fr. *New York*: Longmans, Green, 1933. xii + 73 pp. \$0.68.

**Daudet.**—Le Petit Chose, éd. simplifiée par Howard Mitchell. *Boston*: Heath, 1933. x + 282 pp.

**Dauer, H.**—Der Kunstcharakter der Chanson de Willelme. Diss. *Munich*: 1932. ix + 107 pp.

**Dissen, M.**—Marie Lenéru. Diss. *Bonn*: 1932. 75 pp.

**Doolittle, Dorothy.**—The Relations between literature and Mediaeval studies in Fr. from 1820 to 1860. Diss. *Bryn Mawr*: 1933. viii + 145 pp.

**Duhamel, R.**—Le Rire et les Larmes de Molière. *Paris*: Hachette, 1933. 264 pp.

**Dumas.**—D'Artagnan, épisode des "Trois Mousquetaires," éd. A. G. Bovée et Eunice R. Goddard. *Boston*: Heath, 1933. x +

Dumolard, H.—Autour de Stendhal (docs. inéd.). *Grenoble*: Arthaud, 1932. 155 pp.

Eisenberg, S.—Geschichte des frz. Verbuns bailler (<bauläre). Diss. *Munich*: 1933. 67 pp.

Falls, W. F.—Buffon et l'agrandissement du Jardin du Roi à Paris. U. of Penn. diss. *Philadelphia*: 1933. 75 pp.

Flutre, L.-F.—Les ms. des Faits des Romains. *Paris*: Hachette, 1932. ii + 200 pp.

— Li Fait des Romains dans les litts. fr. et ital. du XIII<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> s. *Ibid.*, 1932. iii + 452 pp.

Goudard, Sœur M. L.—Etude sur les epistres morales d'H. d'Urfé. Diss. *Washington*: Catholic University, 1933. 164 pp.

Gröhler, H.—Ueber Ursprung und Bedeutung der franz. Ortsnamen. II. Teil. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. xv + 491 pp.

Hankiss, J.—Secrets d'Atelier de l'abbé Prévost. *Paris*: Alcan, 1933. 13 pp. (Séances de l'Acad. des sciences morales et politiques.)

Heinen, F. H.—Das Frankreichbild im Werke Paul Adams (1862-1920). Diss. *Bonn*: 1932. iv + 151 pp.

Hucke, S.—Jules Lemaître als Erzähler. Diss. *Bonn*: 1932. 127 pp.

Huguet, E.—Le langage figuré au seizième s. *Paris*: Hachette, 1933. vi + 256 pp. Fr. 15.

Klemperer, V.—Corneille inconnu. *Munich*: Hueber, 1933. 250 pp.

Kuhn, H.—Michelets Landschaftsschilderung in "La Mer" und "La Montagne." *Wertheim am Main*: Bechstein, 1933. 53 pp.

Lanson, G. et Naves, R.—Extraits des philosophes du XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris*: Hachette, 1933. viii + 600 pp.

Lehrmann, K.—Das Humanitätsideal der sozialistisch-romantischen Epoche Frankreichs und seine Beziehung zur Judenfrage. *Wertheim am Main*: Bechstein, 1933. 55 pp.

Lücker, M.—Die franz. Psalmenübersetzungen des XVIII<sup>e</sup> Jahrhunderts. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. viii + 195 pp.

McGhee, D. M.—Voltairean narrative devices as considered in the author's Contes philosophiques. *Manasha, Wis.*: G. Banta, 1933. 191 pp.

Michelet.—Jeanne d'Arc, texte de l'éd. de 1853, éd. F. Flutre. *Paris*: Hachette, 1933. 72 pp. Fr. 1.50.

Mönch, W.—Frankreichs Dichtung von der Renaissance zur Gegenwart im Spiegel geistesgeschichtlicher Probleme. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 51 pp.

Mornet, D.—Les Origines intellectuelles de la Révolution fr. (1715-87). *Paris*: A.

Psichari, H.—Ernest Psichari, mon frère. *Paris*: Plon, 1933. iv + 236 pp.

Rietmann, Ch. E.—Vision et mouvement chez Mallarmé. *Paris*: Presses mod., 1932. xxvii + 51 pp.

Schöll, E.—César Birotteau. *Wertheim a. M.*: Bechstein, 1933. 57 pp.

Serafini, L.—Jules Lemaître, "le critique." *Teramo*: Corso e Cardamone, 1933. 72 pp.

Svukup, R.—Les causes et l'évolution de l'abréviation des pronoms personnels régimes en ancien fr. *Geneva*: Olschki, 1933. 130 pp.

Treske, E.—Der Rosenkreuzerroman "Le Comte de Gabalis" und der geistigen Strömungen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts. Diss. *Greifswald*: 1933. 66 pp.

Vordemann, E.—Quellenstudien zu dem Roman "Le Voyage des princes fortunez" de Béroalde de Verville. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1933. 121 pp.

Wessely, T.—Ein Europäer, Luc Durtain. *Brünn*: Rohrer, 1933. 113 pp.

Williams, E. B.—Fr. short stories of the Nineteenth Century. *New York*: Crofts, 1933. x + 234 pp.

Wolters, K.—Marcel Proust im literarischen Urteil seiner Zeit. Diss. *Munich*: 1932. 75 pp.

## ITALIAN

Abba, G. C.—Maggio 1860. Pagine di un taccuino inedito. Pubblicate e illustrate con la scorta di un carteggio inedito fra G. C. Abba e M. Pratesi da G. Bandini. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1933. 150 pp. L. 12.

Alfonsi, T.—Il dialetto còrso nella parlata balanina. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1932. xxii + 193 pp. L. 18.

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia, a cura di D. Guerri. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. 491 pp. L. 40. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 143.)

— La Divina Commedia. Parafrasi e note di G. Monetti. *Inferno*. *Alba*: Pia soc. "San Paolo," 1932. xv + 312 pp. L. 14.

— La Vita nuova e rime scelte, a cura di A. Tortoreto. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1932. 112 pp. L. 3. (I grandi scrittori.)

— The Divine Comedy, translated into English verse by M. B. Anderson. With notes and elucidations by the translator and with an introduction by A. Livingston. *Verona*: For the Limited Editions Club New York, 1932. 4to., xxi + 492 pp.

Allason, Barbara.—La vita di Silvio Pellico. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1933. xii + 477 pp. L. 35.

Antona-Traversi, C.—Foglie dannunziane.



**Bacchelli, R.**—Confessioni letterarie. *Milano*: Soc. edit. "La cultura," 1932. xiii + 456 pp. L. 25.

**Bargellini, P.**—San Bernardino da Siena. *Brescia*: Ediz. "Morcelliana," 1933. 414 pp. L. 12.

**Benintendi, Piero.**—Lettere di—, mercante del Trecento. Con introduzione, note e appendice a cura di R. Piattoli. *Genova*: Società ligure di storia patria, 1932. 171 pp. (Atti della Società ligure di storia patria, LX, no. 1.)

**Berchet, Giovanni.**—Liriche; prose critiche scelte e commentate da M. L. Gentile. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1932. 125 pp. L. 3. (I grandi scrittori.)

**Biondollo, F.**—Fasti e nefasti. Saggi letterari. *Palermo*: "La tradizione," 1932. 228 pp. L. 12.

**Boccaccio, Giovanni.**—Opere minori. La Fiammetta; l'Ameto; il Corbaccio; Lettera consolatoria a M. Pino de' Rossi. Prefazione di F. Costé. *Milano*: Sonzogno, 1932. 351 pp. L. 4. (Biblioteca classica economica, no. 64.)

**Bondioli, P.**—Un poeta bustese alle nozze di Gian Galeazzo Sforza e Isabella d'Aragona. Per nozze Monaco-Milani, Busto Arsizio, 24 settembre MCMXXVII. *Busto Arsizio*: 1927. 47 pp.

**Bruno, F.**—Narratori tradizionali. *Salerno*: Di Giacomo, 1932. 152 pp. L. 10.

**Bulifon, A.**—Giornali di Napoli dal MDXLVII al MDCCVI. A cura di Nino Cortese. Volume I: MDXLVII-MDCXCI. *Napoli*: Società napoletana di storia patria, 1932. lv + 295 pp. L. 60. (Cronache e documenti per la storia dell'Italia meridionale dei secoli XVI e XVII, vol. IV.)

**Calamari, G.**—Il confidente di Pio II: card. Jacopo Ammannati-Piccolomini; 1422-1479. Prefazione di A. Sorbelli. *Roma-Milano*: "Augustea," 1932. 2 vols., xiv + 280, 281-610 pp. L. 25.

**Campanella, Tommaso.**—La città del sole. Con prefazione. *Milano*: Sonzogno, 1932. 96 pp. L. 1.20. (Biblioteca universale, no. 433.)

**Capasso, A.**—Incontri con Ungaretti. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1933. 162 pp. L. 10. (Collezione degli scrittori nuovi, no. 3.)

**Carrara, E.**—Jacopo Sannazaro; 1456-1530. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 113 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

**Cazzamini Mussi, F.**—Aneddoti milanesi. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1932. 189 pp. L. 9. (Aneddotica, no. 19.)

**Cellini, Benvenuto.**—La vita scritta da lui medesimo. Nuova edizione scolastica con

*Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1932. xxi + 502 pp. L. 15. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

**Cocchiara, G.**—Il linguaggio del gesto. *Torino*: F.lli Bocca, 1932. xiii + 131 pp. L. 10. (Piccola biblioteca di scienze moderne, no. 390.)

**Costa, G.**—Tra le vere glorie del Settecento italiano. Ab. Giovanni Costa di Asiago. 1737-1816. Notizie biografiche e illustrative. *Padova*: Tip. libreria edit. Antoniana, 1932. 205 pp. L. 12.

**Croce, Benedetto.**—Poesia popolare e poesia d'arte. Studi sulla poesia italiana dal Tre al Cinquecento. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. xii + 521 pp. L. 40. (Scritti di storia letteraria e politica, XXVIII.)

**Culcasi, C.**—G. B. Marino, 1569-1625. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 95 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

**Curto, C.**—Luigi Pulci; 1432-1484. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 108 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

**D'Amato, A.**—Conferenze e profili manzoniani. *Ascoli Piceno*: Società tipo-litogr., 1932. 246 pp. L. 6.

**D'Ambra, L.**—L'Italia dei poeti drammatici. *Firenze*: "Nemi," 1932. 72 pp. L. 5. (Visioni spirituali d'Italia.)

**De' Medici, Lorenzo.**—Le più belle pagine, scelte da R. Palmarocchi. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1933. xviii + 282 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 60.)

**Della Casa, G.**—Il galateo ed il trattato degli uffici comuni tra gli amici inferiori e superiori. Edizione riveduta. *Milano*: Bietti, 1932. 144 pp. L. 3.

**Della Croce, Giulio Cesare.**—Bertoldo, Bertoldino e Cacaseno. Nuova edizione delle loro sottilissime astuzie e sentenze. *Milano*: Bietti, 1932. 221 pp. L. 2.40.

**Della Valle, G.**—I grandi pensatori del Mezzogiorno. *Salerno*: Gruppo di cultura magistrale, 1932. 193 pp.

**De Marchi, E.**—Vecchie cadenze e nuove. Poesie. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1933. vii + 193 pp. L. 8.

**Dossi, Carlo.**—Le più belle pagine scelte da P. Nardi. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1932. x + 309 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 59.)

**D'Ovidio, F.**—Nuovi studi danteschi. Vol. I-III. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1932. 3 vols., xi + 369, viii + 286, xv + 387 pp. L. 20 each volume. (Opere, II, 1, 2, 3.)

Degli Orfini, 1933. 217 pp. L. 12. (Collana della nuova cultura, no. 2.)

Fatini, G.—Agnolo Firenzuola; 1493-1543. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 112 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche ed analisi estetiche.)

Favari, Gemma.—Da Martin Piaggio a Niccolò Bacigalupo. Studio sullo svolgersi dell'attività poetica dialettale in Genova nel secolo XIX. *Genova*: Tip. Nazionale, 1932. 183 pp. L. 10.

Ferrandi, M.—Leggende e riti atesini. Prefazione di S. Maurano. *Bolzano*: Ediz. "Brennero," 1932. 102 pp. L. 5.

Ferri, A.—Creature manzoniane. Seconda edizione accresciuta di quattro saggi. *Ancona*: Fogola, 1933. xv + 482 pp. L. 14.

Fusco, E. M.—Tormento di poeti. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1933. 193 pp. L. 10.

Gastaldi, M.—La santa passione. *Como*: E. Cavallieri, 1932. 357 pp. L. 15.

Giannotti, Donato.—Lettere a Piero Vettori, pubblicate sopra gli originali del British Museum da R. Ridolfi e C. Roth. Con un saggio illustrativo a cura di R. Ridolfi. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1932. viii + 207 pp. L. 25.

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Epistolario, raccolto, ordinato e annotato da F. Martini. Con XXI appendici illustrative. Nuova edizione con l'aggiunta di sessantadue lettere e di altre due appendici. Vol. I-IV. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1932. 4 vols., xii + 562, 591, 391, 398 pp. L. 15 each volume. (Biblioteca nazionale.)

Goldoni, Carlo.—Il ventaglio. Commedia in tre atti in prosa. Introduzione e note di G. Parisi. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1932. 100 pp. L. 3.

—La famiglia dell'antiquario. Commedia in tre atti. Introduzione e note di G. Parisi. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1932. 102 pp. L. 3.

—La locandiera. Commedia in 3 atti in prosa. Introduzione e note di G. Parisi. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1932. 104 pp. L. 3.

Lodi, Teresa.—Il Sismondi e la "Stadl veneziana" (Isabella Teotochi Albrizzi). *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1932. 24 pp. (Repr. fr. "Civiltà moderna," IV, 1932.)

Lombardi Satriani, R.—Canti popolari calabresi, a cura di —. *Napoli*: E. De Simone, 1932. xii + 344 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca delle tradizioni popolari calabresi, III.)

Lo Parco, F.—Francesco Petrarca e Tommaso Caloria all'Università di Bologna. *Imola*: P. Galeati, 1932. 159 pp. (Repr. fr. "Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna," XI.)

italiana per le scuole medie superiori. Volume I: Dalle origini all'umanesimo. *Palermo*: "Ires," 1932. 199 pp. L. 8.50.

Magnotti, L.—L'abbé Ferdinand Galiani. Sa philanthropie et ses rapports avec la France. *Napoli*: R. Pironti, 1932. 193 pp.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Adelchi. Tragedia in cinque atti. Con prefazione e commento di Annabruna Porciani. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1932. 160 pp. L. 3.25. (I grandi scrittori.)

—Liriche e tragedie. Con prefazione e note di L. Russo. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1932. xv + 296 pp. L. 12. (Classici italiani commentati.)

Marri Martini, Lilia.—Angelica Montanini nella storia e nella novella. *Siena*: "La Diana," 1932. 4to., 14 pp.

Mascherpa, Maria.—Edoardo Calandra: la vita e l'opera letteraria. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1933. 350 pp. L. 15. (Studi e ritratti, XIII.)

Mazzetti, R.—Tito Speri. Vita, scritti, testimonianze con carteggio e documenti inediti. Prefazione di L. Russo. *Brescia*: G. Vannini, 1932. 211 pp. L. 10.

Mazzini, Giuseppe.—Scritti politici e letterari e "I doveri dell'uomo." Con introduzione e note di L. De Regibus. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1933. 112 pp. L. 3. (I grandi scrittori.)

Nulli, S. A.—L'emulo di Bruto: Lorenzino de' Medici. *Milano*: "Athena," 1933. 265 pp. L. 12.

Occhini, P. L.—Corradini. *Firenze*: "Rinascimento del libro," 1933. xlvii + 324 pp. L. 12.

Ortiz, R.—Varia romanica. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1932. 524 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca di cultura, no. 3.)

Pagano, A.—Saggi e profili di storia letteraria. *Nicotera*: Istituto edit. calabrese, 1932. 317 pp. L. 20.

Panzini, A.—Guida alla grammatica italiana, con un prontuario delle incertezze. Libretto utile per ogni persona. *Firenze*: R. Bemporad e figlio, 1932. 92 pp. L. 5.

Papini, Giovanni.—Dante vivo. *Firenze*: Libreria edit. fiorentina, 1932. 445 pp. L. 16.

Pappacena, E.—Frammenti. Vol. II. *Lanciano*: Carosella e Valerio, 1932. 315 pp. L. 15.

Perroni Grande, L.—Vittorio Visalli. Dodicesima lettura di storia letteraria calabrese. *Reggio Calabria*: "Fata morgana," 1932. 40 pp.

Petrarca, Francesco.—Dal Canzoniere e dai Trionfi. Rime scelte e commentate da F. Ravello, con un'introduzione su "L'animo del Petrarca." *Torino*: Società edit. inter-

(Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Pizzagalli, A.—Le gemme rime. Rimario Dannunziano, con note e richiami. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1932. xi + 142 pp. L. 8.

Raccolta di stornelli toscani e rispetti amorosi cantati dal popolo italiano. *Napoli*: F. Bideri, 1932. 96 pp.

Restori, V.—Contro corrente. Note critiche e discussioni intorno a le origini della lingua italiana. Consensi e dissensi. Osservazioni. *Mantova*: "La Stampa," 1932. 19 pp.

Rho, E.—Lorenzo de' Medici, 1449-1492. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 80 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

Rizzi, F., e Cerini, M.—I classici minori. A cura di —. Vol. I: Poeti siciliani e toscani del sec. XIII. Opere minori di Dante, Fioretti di S. Francesco ecc. *Catania*: C. Galàtola, 1929. ii + 324 pp. L. 12.

Romano, P.—Pasquino e la satira in Roma. *Roma*: V. Ferri, 1932. 215 pp. L. 10.

Rugadi, Annamaria.—Tommaso Fedra Inghirami umanista volterrano; 1470-1516. *Amatrice*: Scuola tip. Orfanotrofo maschile, 1933. 157 pp. L. 10.

Sacchetti, Franco.—Le novelle, recate a buona lezione e dichiarate con note, e con prefazione di E. Camerini. *Milano*: Sonzogno, 1933. 432 pp. L. 4. (Biblioteca classica economica, no. 10.)

Salvadori, Giulio.—Liriche e saggi. A cura di C. Calcaterra. Vol. I-III. *Milano*: "Vita e pensiero," 1933. 3 vols., 326, 318, 468 pp. L. 75. (Pubblicazioni della Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore, serie IV, vol. XIV-XVI.)

Sassi, R.—Un carteggio inedito del Tiraboschi. *Fabriano*: Tip. Gentile, 1932. 28 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Atti e memorie della R. Deputazione di storia patria per le Marche," serie VI, vol. VIII, fasc. I.)

Sborselli, G.—Tendenze e valori della nuova letteratura italiana. Discorso. *Portici*: Tip. Bellavista, 1933. 30 pp.

Scandura, S.—L'estetica di Dante, Petrarca e Boccaccio. *Acireale*: Tip. edit. "XX Secolo," 1928. 215 pp. L. 25.

Sciaccia, M. F.—Torquato Tasso nella mente di Giacomo Leopardi. *Aquila*: Vecchioni, 1933. 62 pp. L. 5.

Sgroi, C.—Saggi e problemi di critica letteraria. *Catania*: Studio editoriale moderno, 1932. 274 pp. L. 10.

Sias, G. B.—Una rivendicazione: Ugo Foscolo. *Sassari*: G. Gallizzi, 1932. xv + 150 pp. L. 10.

Silenzi, R. e F.—Cinquecento pasquinate, scelte, commentate e annotate da —, con

figure, degli ambienti. *Milano*: V. Bompiani, 1932. xi + 424 pp. L. 40.

Sorbelli, A.—Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia. Vol. LI: Fano. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1932. 260 pp.

Spreti, V.—Enciclopedia storico-nobiliare italiana. Volume VI. Prima ristampa. *Milano*: Ediz. Enciclopedia stor.-nobiliare ital., 1932. 1045 pp. L. 250.

Tagliacozzo, E.—Di alcune correnti ideologiche del Risorgimento. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1932. 88 pp. L. 8.

Terenghi, L.—Piano schematico e contenuto sintetico della Divina Commedia. *Parma*: Donati, 1932. 108 pp.

Tommaseo, Niccolò.—A cura di A. Baroni. *Torino*: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1932. 284 pp. (Pagine cristiane antiche e moderne, no. 17.)

Torchia, A.—Storia della letteratura italiana, con analisi estetiche, giudizi, prose e poesie scelte a commentate da M. Pugliese. Volume III, parte II: L'Ottocento. *Catanzaro*: G. Mauro, 1932. 833 pp. L. 20.

Tordi, D.—Relazione sulla tomba e sulle presunte ossa di Giovanni Boccaccio. *Castelfiorentino*: Giovanelli e Carpitelli, 1932. iv + 71 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Miscellanea della Valdelsa.")

Trillo, S.—Andrea Giuliano politico e letterato veneziano del quattrocento. *Ginevra-Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1932. xi + 207 pp. Fr. 10. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum Romanicum," serie I, no. 18.)

Verga, Giovanni.—I Malavoglia. (I vinti.) Romanzo. Edizione definitiva. *Firenze*: R. Bemporad e figlio, 1930. 276 pp. L. 10. (Opere di Giovanni Verga.)

Viani-Modena, Clelia.—Un letterato cristiano: Cesare Guasti; 1822-1889. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1932. xvi + 322 pp. L. 12.

Viviani, A.—Giubbe rosse; 1913-1914-1915. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1933. 253 pp. L. 10.

Zaccagnini, G.—I rimatori bolognesi del secolo XIII. Edizione critica a cura di —. *Milano*: Società edit. "Vita e pensiero," 1933. 161 pp. L. 10. ("Orbis romanus": biblioteca di testi medievali a cura dell'Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore, no. 1.)

Zacchi, Osvaldo.—Poesie, e la sua vita scritta dal figlio Luigi. *Belluno*: Tip. Somnavilla, 1929. iv + 490 pp. L. 20.

Zamboni, A.—Conoscenze. Profili e ragguagli di contemporanei. Seconda serie di "Scrittori nostri." *Reggio Emilia*: R. Boiardi, 1932. 278 pp. L. 17.

Zanchetti, M.—Il sensualismo panteistico di Gabriele D'Annunzio. *Reggio Emilia*: "Poesia d'Italia," 1931. 83 pp. L. 5.

Zottoli, A.—Il sistema di Don Abbondio. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. xi + 140 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no.

## SPANISH

Coloma, L.—Boy. *Madrid*: Razón y Fe, (s. a.). 272 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras completas, XV.)

—Fray Francisco. Narración histórica. Introducción. Libro primero. *Madrid*: Razón y Fe, (s. a.). 236 pp. 4 ptas. (Obras completas, XVII.)

Díez, D. — Bibliografía del Estado de Morelos. *México*: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1933. ccxxiii + 427 pp. 5 pesos.

Fábulas y cuentos en verso.—Selección, notas y glosario por María Goyri de Menéndez Pidal. 2ª ed. *Madrid*: Instituto Escuela, 1933. 234 pp. 3.50 ptas.

Guillén Tato, J. F.—Repertorio de los manuscritos, cartas, planos y dibujos relativos a las Californias existentes en este Museo. *Madrid*: Ministerio de Marina, 1932. 127 pp. 30 ptas.

Léon, Fray Luis de.—La perfecta casada. Ed. por L. Astrana Marín. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1933. 218 pp. 8 ptas.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M. — La ciencia española. Ed. por M. Artigas. Tomo I. *Madrid*: V. Suárez, 1933. 478 pp. 20 ptas.

Orrego Vicuña, E.—Vicuña MacKenna. Vida y trabajos. *Santiago de Chile*: Prensas de la Universidad, 1932. 540 pp.

Ortega y Gasset, J.—El Espectador. Tomos I, II, III. 4ª ed. en un vol. *Madrid*: Revista de Occidente, 1933. 516 pp. 10 ptas.

Pérez Galdós, B.—Crónica de Madrid. Obra inédita. Pról. de A. Ghirardo. *Madrid*: Edit. Castro, (s. a.). 225 pp. 5 ptas.

Prosistas modernos.—Selección hecha por E. Díez-Canedo. 4ª ed. *Madrid*: Instituto Escuela, 1933. 343 pp.

Sánchez Cantón, F. J.—Spanien. *Madrid*: P. N. T., 1933. 162 pp.

Suárez, C.—Escritores españoles, Antología. *Barcelona*: Ed. Juventud, 1933. 232 pp. 7 ptas.

Unamuno, M. de.—San Manuel Bueno, mártir y tres historias más. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 324 pp. 5 ptas.

Urabayen, L. — Geografía humana de Navarra. Tomo II. La vivienda. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1932. 173 pp. 15 ptas.

Valle-Arizpe, A.—Virreyes y Virreinas de la Nueva España. Segunda serie. Leyendas, tradiciones y sucesos del México virreinal. *Madrid*: Biblioteca Nueva, 1933 (?). 374 pp. 6 ptas.

Vendrell, F.—La corte literaria de Alfonso V de Aragón y tres poetas de la misma. *Madrid*: Tip. de Archivos, 1933. 114 pp. (Tesis doctoral.)

## CATALAN

Casanovas, I.—La cultura catalana del segle XVIII. *Barcelona*: Bibl. Balmes, 1932. 40 pp. (Acadèmia de Bones Lletres de Barcelona.)

Diccionari enciclopèdic de la Llengua Catalana.—Fascículo XIV. *Barcelona*: Salvat, 1933. 9 ptas.

Epistolari d'en M. Milà i Fontanals.—Correspondencia recollida i anotada per L. Nicolau d'Olwer. Tomo II. Anys 1875-1880. *Barcelona*: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1932. 256 pp. 15 ptas.

Fullana, L.—Ortografia valenciana. Segunda ed. *Valencia*: "La Semana Gráfica," 1933. 104 pp.

García Silvestre, M.—Historia sumaria de la literatura catalana. Proleg i bibliografia de M. de Montolíu. *Manresa*: Edit. Balmes, 1932. xvi + 424 pp. 5 ptas.

Gelabert, Rincón, J.—Etimología de la Vell d'Aro, provincia de Girona. *Girona*: Edit. Gironina, 1932. 24 pp. 1 pta.

Gelabert y Crosa, J.—Gramática catalana. *Gerona*: Dalmau, 1932. 56 pp.

Llorente Falcó, T.—Mistral i Llorente, recull de notícies i impressions. *Valencia*: L'Estel, 1932. 180 pp.

Renat i Ferris, G.—La conjugació dels verbs en valencià. *Castelló de la Plana*: Societat Castellonenca de Cultura, 1933. 76 pp. 2 ptas.

Salvador, C.—Quaderns d'orientació valencianista. II: Vocabulari ortogràfic valencià. *Valencia*: L'Estel, [1933]. 72 pp.

## GENERAL

De Bosis, L.—Icaro. With a translation from the Italian by Ruth Draper, and a preface by Gilbert Murray. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1933. x + 201 pp. \$3.00.

Forty-eighth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology. *Washington*: Smithsonian, 1933. 1220 pp.

Giusso, L.—Tre profili: Dostojewsky-Freud-Ortega y Gasset. *Napoli*: A. Giuda, 1933. 114 pp. L. 4.50.

Jespersen, Otto.—Linguistica: Selected Papers in English, French and German. *Copenhagen*: Levin & Munksgaard, 1933. Pp. vi + 462.

Mosccardelli, N.—Anime e corpi. Saggi critici sulla letteratura contemporanea. *Catania*: Studio editoriale moderno, 1932. vi + 274 pp. L. 10.

Reichenkron, G.—Passivum, Medium und Reflexivum in den romanischen Sprachen.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIX

FEBRUARY, 1934

Number 2

---

## THE FRAMING-TALE<sup>1</sup>

When Chaucer decided to write a series of tales boxed in the frame of a Canterbury pilgrimage he essayed a form of literature already very ancient, though no previous writer had looked so far as he into the artistic possibilities of the type. The earliest series of boxed stories that we have is that of the Westcar Papyrus, an ancient Egyptian document, which survives in a mutilated condition but is sufficiently complete to make clear that it presents us with the literary form in question. The sons of King Khufu or Cheops tell each a tale of magic until one of them cries out that there lives a magician who surpasses those of whom the stories have been told. Accordingly the magician referred to is summoned by royal command and exhibits his powers in the royal presence. The papyrus belongs possibly to an age when the delineation of character was unknown to literary art. Certainly, if we omit a few passages of primitive humor which describe the great age of the magician and his enormous voracity, a humor which is not for the modern adult reader, the entire interest of the document lies in its great antiquity, in the feats of magic described, and in the fact

<sup>1</sup> This essay was originally intended as a chapter of a treatise on the *Canterbury Tales*. A draft of this treatise was completed about 1917, but I decided to lay the manuscript aside for five or ten years in order to revise it to better purpose. Unfortunately, I have since become intensely interested in other subjects, and my recollections of some matters are not so clear as I could wish. The essay is therefore presented with very little revision in the hope that, whatever may be its defects, it may justify itself in the eyes of the class of readers for whom it is intended. No attempt is made at a history of the framing tale, or at an inventory of such collections. I have merely tried to discuss a few examples of outstanding interest, and these from the point of view of literary art rather than of genetic connection.

that the author is using a literary device later used by Boccaccio and Chaucer. One would be glad indeed to recover the formula for laying bare the bottom of a lake in order to recover a lost jewel; or for making a crocodile of wax which will become a live one when thrown into the water but when picked up by the tail will again be a thing of wax. The reader recalls how Moses' rod became a serpent, and how he laid bare the bottom of the sea. And here the interest of most modern readers will probably end.<sup>2</sup>

But in India the collections of boxed tales were far more finished in their execution. They belong largely to the type of moral tale. The Panchatantra and the Hitopadesha tell fables about animals resembling the fables of Aesop; and are thickly sown with shrewd, and not infrequently with noble proverbs, for the coinage of which the highly reflective mind of the Hindu had a striking aptitude. As often as a jackal or a tortoise wishes to enforce his point he tells a fable to illustrate it, and in the secondary fable some animal will point a remark with yet another fable. The Hitopadesha is a series of stories told by a renowned sage who has undertaken to enlighten the simple-minded sons of a prince. With amazing optimism he promises to do this in the space of six moons. Including this outer frame-work of the sage and the princes as the first story, we find that the Hitopadesha occasionally presents a story within a story within a story within a story; which may be conveniently expressed by saying that the story is sometimes involved to the fourth degree.

The esteem in which we shall hold the literary art of the Hitopadesha will depend on whether our attention is directed to the boxing-process or to the fables which are thus boxed. The boxing evinces a perverse ingenuity. A fable clogs the action of the fable in which it is inserted to such a degree that perhaps only one who has learned the Hitopadesha by heart, as the Hindus and the Chinese habitually do learn books, will have a clear idea which story is resumed when another is finished. Somadeva, the author of the most extensive and involved of all collections of boxed stories in Sanskrit, declared that in weaving story into story he had not

<sup>2</sup> On the *Westcar Papyrus* consult: *Die Märchen des Papyrus Westcar*. Herausgegeben von Adolf Erman, Berlin, 1890; *Egyptian Tales. Translated from the Papyri. First Series. IVth to XIIth Dynasty*. Edited by W. M. Flinders Petrie, London, 1895, pp. 46-47. *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptian*, by E. A. Wallis Budge, London, 1914, pp. 25-36.

aspired to a reputation for ingenuity but had sought to assist the memory. But it is difficult for an occidental mind to conceive how the process could have even a mnemonic value.

Regarded in themselves the animal-fables possess very considerable interest. Real art is shown in the presentation of character, and along with much shrewd and pointed wisdom in the proverbs there is a truly interesting humor alike in the speeches and in the conduct of the animal-personages. It has often been remarked that in the Indian fables the animals speak not in character for the animals that they really are but like human beings. The immemorial respect and indeed veneration of the Hindus for the lower animals rendered this for them a natural method. And no doubt the idea of a cat or a jackal professing pious practices, such as fasting and ablutions, is to the Hindu less amusing than to us. Nevertheless the situations of the Hindu fable have their inevitable humor for all readers, and it is the professed purpose of the author to amuse while he instructs. The remark that the animals talk like human beings and not like animals should not be too rigidly construed. The fable-makers are not destitute of powers of observation, and show a limited measure of fancy in fitting observed facts of animal life with anthropomorphic interpretations.

I have already remarked that the sanguine philosopher of the Hitopadesha offers to educate the foolish princes in the short space of six moons. The tone of the book clearly implies that he is successful. This is a ludicrous exaggeration of the power of education to educate. If a man is really a fool a life-time will do little to educate him. But further than this it is difficult to conceive how the recital of the brief fables of the Hitopadesha, thirty-four in number, could possibly have been spread over a period so long as even six moons. This period would more than suffice for a diligent student to learn the Sanskrit language and read the entire Hitopadesha in the original; whereas the princes and their teacher have their Sanskrit to start with. And the fables are recited at only four sittings, and anybody can read the whole book easily in an afternoon—in a translation. It is not that the fable-makers and collectors had that disregard of time which to our eyes seems specifically oriental. Rather is it that in literary narrative time is, after all, a matter of very limited importance. The less we are reminded of its passage the more vivid the illusion of the narrative.

An astonishing amount of labor and ingenuity has been wasted in the discussion how many days it took Chaucer's Pilgrims to go from Southwark to Canterbury—a discussion as futile as that of the so-called unity of time in the drama.

Sometimes the frame of a series of tales is a real story; sometimes it is merely a situation to which the author reverts as often as he finishes a tale. In the latter case all the stories are told by the same person and with the same purpose, and not infrequently this purpose is to delay action on the part of the listener. Thus the Sanskrit *Seventy Tales by a Parrot* are intended to delay a woman who is bent on a love-affair; and, in Arabian literature, Scheherazade tells the *Arabian Nights* in such an entertaining manner that her husband repeatedly defers his intention of putting her to death, and finally decides to let her live. In the Sanskrit *Twenty-Five Tales by a Vampire* the stories are all told by the Vampire in order to make the King speak and thereby undo a task which for reasons of magic must be accomplished in perfect silence. In collections of this description, greatly as the stories may vary in subject and character, there can, of course, be absolutely no thought of differentiating the tales according to the character of their respective narrators, or to the situation under which each story is told. For there is but one narrator, and a single situation, the situation which is repeated as often as the story is told. Furthermore, even in those collections where the stories are told by different persons, the adaptation of the tale to the character of the teller is scarcely attempted. Chaucer introduced a nearly new principle into the art of framing tales when he assigned romances to his Knight and his Squire, tales of low life to his Miller and his Reeve, and religious stories to his Prioress and his Second Nun.

The boxed tales of the Hindus were translated into various languages of India, and occur in Arabic, in Persian and in Syriac. Even in the far-off language of Mongolia there are extant three series of the type, with indications that yet a fourth, the so-called *Seventy Tales by a Parrot* once existed in this language.<sup>3</sup> And so congenial did Hindu authors find the process of boxing or framing that we find it extensively practised in their epic poetry, as in the

<sup>3</sup> See Julg, *Mongolische Märchensammlungen, Einleitung*.



*Mahabharata*. That the process was practised in epic poetry a thousand years earlier and more, in the *Odyssey* of the Greeks, seems never to have been correlated with the history of the framing-tale, and I may be pardoned therefore for dwelling at some length upon a matter so important. As a tale-framer Homer is the most interesting, and for Europe and America the most widely known of all the predecessors of Chaucer. There will undoubtedly be some who prefer the stories of the *Decameron* to the fairytales which Odysseus recites to Alcinous, but unquestionably the *Odyssey* presents the more artistic setting of one tale within another.

Wilhelm Grimm collected some nine wonder-stories bearing each its striking resemblance to the story of Polyphemus. In all of these the hero saves his life by blinding a powerful enemy—a giant, an ogre or the devil. In five the enemy is a cannibal; in five he has but a single eye; in four the hero escapes by covering himself with the skin of a ram or of a sheep; in one he escapes the consequences of his deed by giving himself a pun-name, calling himself “Self” just as Odysseus said his name was *Oὔτις* which means “Nobody.” In another analog the hero hangs all night long from a hen perch, as Odysseus from the belly of the ram; in another the enemy throws stones at the hero’s raft; and there are other resemblances.<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore in Grimm’s fairy-tales and in Somadeva’s Hindu collection entitled “The Ocean of the Streams of Story” we have striking analogs to the story of Circe, the Hindu version knitting together features of the stories of Charybdis, of Nausicaa and Phaeacia, of Calypso and of Circe. “The hero of the tale, a Brahman named Saktideva, is saved from a great whirlpool, like Ulysses, by climbing into the branches of a fig-tree which overhangs it. He is then carried through the air to the Golden City and is there entertained by the Vidyadhari (or fairy) queen who is destined to have a mortal for her husband. ‘Many as are the noble Vidyadharis that my father has proposed to me, I have refused them all, and am still a maiden’ (like Nausicaa). But before a marriage

<sup>4</sup> Since this was written Sir James Frazer has published as an appendix to his edition of Apollodorus in the *Loeb Library*, a collection of thirty-six variants of the story of Polyphemus. My attention has been called to this collection by my friend Professor A. M. Harmon.

can be arranged Saktideva is suddenly conveyed back to his father's house, and marries his original love the princess Kanarekha." <sup>5</sup>

These illustrations make perfectly clear how closely the tales to Alcinous resemble the fairy-stories that circulate in the folk-lore of nations, but to conclude as has frequently been done, that they originally existed independently one of another; that they were originally told of nameless heroes and laid in nameless countries; and that they gradually gathered about the commanding personality of the resourceful Odysseus very much as in the Middle Ages all manner of tales gathered about the figures of Charlemagne or Alexander; and that Homer, by whom we mean the poet to whom the *Odyssey* owes its essential greatness, found them already in their places; this is unwarrantable. The stories collected by Somadeva are not unlikely to contain matter directly descended from the *Odyssey*, and modified as it passed for centuries from mouth to mouth or from manuscript to manuscript. And the adventures of the Arabic sailor Sindbad contain one which so closely resembles the story of Polyphemus as to suggest that the Arabs did not so utterly disregard the imaginative literature of Greece as has frequently been represented. In fact we cannot be absolutely sure that the tales to Alcinous were not of the poet's own invention.

And indeed the hypothesis that the tales in question, however they may have originated, were first associated with Odysseus by Homer himself, gains plausibility from the fact that the epic is elsewhere occupied with tale-boxing. Besides the stories of Odysseus to Alcinous there are those of Nestor and Menelaus to Telemachus, there is the song of Demodocus concerning Ares and Aphrodite, and there are the autobiographies exchanged by Odysseus and the swineherd Eumaeus. Odysseus, while in disguise, tells yet other stories to explain his arrival in Ithaca. And when the ghosts tell Odysseus their histories, or the Old Man of the Sea tells Menelaus of the murder of Agamemnon, we actually reach involution to the third degree: a tale within a tale within a tale.

The fact that the poet nowhere practises tale-framing merely for tale-framing, has generally obscured to students, whether of Greek or of other literatures, the fact that he is a remarkable tale-framer. He also exhibits an extraordinary skill. The result is no matter

<sup>5</sup> Munro, *Odyssey XIII-XXIV*, p. 293.

of mere ingenuity nor of mnemonic value, but of artistic beauty. The *Odyssey* does not wholly escape a charge of longueurs and tedious passages, but these are never due to the boxing of tale within tale. Indeed to readers not a few it is precisely in the stories to Alcinous that the poem reaches its supreme interest. And nowhere does one story, containing or contained, blur or impede another. Whatever the degree of involution, whether we have tale within tale, or tale within tale within tale, the narrative, framed or framing, is interesting and often intensely so. The perfunctory repetition of a mere situation, which we have seen to be a characteristic defect of Sanskrit method, is discreetly avoided. Only once is the long discourse of Odysseus to Alcinous interrupted, and then in the most natural and graceful way,—as if to make us aware that the Phaeacians are rapt in wonder as they listen,—without really breaking the thread of Odysseus' narrative. Nestor and Menelaus both receive Telemachus in their homes and tell him their adventures, but no third hero repeats the situation. And the accounts of Telemachus at Pylus and at Sparta are true pictures of travel, as varied as they are interesting and beautiful.

To the question how far are the framed tales of the *Odyssey* adapted to the characters of the tellers, I fancy there will be no unanimous answer. The inserted stories are for the most part portions of the personal history of the tellers. The exceptions are the songs of Demodocus and a few mendacious stories told by Odysseus to fortify his disguise. The songs are suited to the profession of the minstrel, the lies are suited to the wise man of an age when cunning was a large part of wisdom. On the other hand the long series of adventures in fairy-land occasionally seems to show that Odysseus was not originally their hero. In particular, it is not quite obviously like the prudent Odysseus to enter the cave of Polyphemus, and yet more fool-hardy for him thrice to taunt a giant who can throw so far. For the rest it is precisely in the Cyclops' den that Odysseus displays his greatest self-command, resourcefulness and cunning. Again Odysseus is a proverb for conjugal fidelity. What then of his relations with Circe and Calypso? Do these merely reflect an age when the highest fidelity was rude and imperfect or are they adventures originally belonging to another hero?

It is in the story told to Odysseus by the ghost of Agamemnon

that characterization of the kind we are seeking especially occurs. A brave warrior, an affectionate brother and a mighty paladin, Agamemnon is nevertheless too small a man for his high position. He becomes morose and vengeful when Calchas and Achilles oppose him; he is subject to panic and despair; the wounding of Menelaus calls forth a stream of mournful eloquence for which it is immediately shown that there is no cause. On the celebrated night of the supplications to Achilles, the night which Diomed and Odysseus spend in action, it is Agamemnon who most loses his self-command, who plucks his hair and wallows in discouragement. On several occasions he incurs a reprimand from one of his subordinates. That the treachery of Clytemnestra should inspire his ghost with bitterness toward all women is eminently like him. In fact no characters of the *Odyssey* speak and act more in character than the ghosts in the Eleventh Book. Antikleia, the mother of Odysseus, is an especially fine example. It is remarkable with how much womanly, maternal interest she is surrounded in a very few lines.

The situation amid which Odysseus tells of his hair-breadth escapes is one of profound serenity and peace. After his last shipwreck the wanderer is cast among a fairy-folk, the Phaeacians, gracious and hospitable. Perceiving that the stranger has suffered sorrows they make a united effort to infuse into his soul a portion of their contagious joy. Nausicaa, a thing of sweetest dignity and discretion, yet with eyes sparkling with the expectation of love, gives him his first welcome; and except for one little discord, without which the situation might seem unreal—it is a quarrel from which Odysseus emerges easily triumphant—all Phaeacia joins in an effort to charm every ache out of his soul. Then, exactly when it becomes appropriate that Odysseus should contribute to the entertainment of his host, he is made to tell his story.

Boccaccio did not make the acquaintance of Homer till after he had finished the *Decameron*. It is therefore a striking coincidence that he made the frame to his tales, which is also their background, one of deep serenity. He assures us that his stories were intended for women. Bentley—heaven knows why—declared that the *Odyssey* was intended for women. The agony and desolation of the plague at Florence, from which Pampinea and the rest retire to the hills north and east of the city, intensifies the sense of comfort and repose which the story-tellers find in their secluded

retreat, which is described with such particularity that scholars have been eager to identify it. Perhaps, too, the plague tends to explain, as a natural effect of the demoralizing sorrows from which they have fled, the excessive and unreal frequency with which Boccaccio introduces tales of a licentious nature, some of them told even by the ladies. But whereas Nausicaa is no mere vision of lovely womanhood as it never existed but truly human, sweet, dignified and normal, and certain other Phaeacians are only less real and human, Boccaccio's seven ladies and three gentlemen belong very nearly to still life. They live, move and have their being only as do figures in a tapestry. Even the incident where the ladies, in a cool secluded spot, disrobe and bathe has less of animation and joy than many a picture.

There is but one place where the setting of the *Decameron* between tale and tale assumes the full character of narrative, and this is of course the quarrel between the servants Licisca and Tindaro, which is as if the spirit of Boccaccio's stories had overflowed into their setting, and besides relieving the monotony of the plan gives to the whole *Decameron* an air of unity which perfect separation of the tales from the setting could not have achieved.

The effect of the setting as a whole, however, remains that of a background, dim, and unobtrusive. Dioneo alone of the ten narrators makes a distinct—by no means is it a striking—impression of individuality. M. Hauvette, indeed, discovers traces of the quality in a few others, but he does so by conscientious exploration, and I doubt whether his is not one of those illusions to which over-minute examinations are subject. The introductions and conclusions, the links between tale and tale of the *Decameron* are like the letters of a friend who has nothing to relate, but has confidence that between friend and friend the mere lack of news is good news and welcome. Everybody is happy therefore there is no history to be told. There is a charm about these ten figures, scarcely any of whom can be called a character. We watch them as we might watch the costumes and decorous motions of a lawn party, without knowing who is who, or what he or she is like.

The nature of this setting gives Boccaccio the widest possible freedom in the selection and assignment of the tales. Traces of an effort to fit the tale to the teller are at best faint and sporadic. Even the ladies tell tales that are licentious; even Dioneo tells two

that are not, one of them being the story of Griselda to which, indeed, he imparts a neo-pagan tone and an occasional comment of blunt common sense which Petrarch, for pietistic reasons, suppressed when he re-told the story after Boccaccio. Boccaccio is pre-occupied with other considerations than the character of his story-tellers, with considerations that may be classed as mathematical and structural; with mass, variety, proportion, symmetry and rhythm. No other collection of anything like the same number of framed tales gives such an effect of harmonious unity and wholeness "Boccaccio," says M. Hauvette, "desired that his hundred tales should appear in a fixed order, capable of giving them a certain cohesion, of introducing into them an element of variety, and of so contriving the pauses that their periodic return brings out the symmetry of the plan."<sup>6</sup> One thinks almost of the subtle and elusive irregularities which point and emphasize the unity of the Parthenon. Everywhere is the feeling for design that characterizes the races of the Mediterranean.

It is worth observing that certain types of story included in the *Canterbury Tales* are absent from the *Decameron*. There is in the Italian collection no animal fable, like the *Nun's Priest's Tale*; neither is there any story that treats religion seriously and with respect, or that employs the supernatural except where the supernatural is due to magic. Neither does Boccaccio anywhere give us a homily in place of a story. The romantic, the tragic, the comic and the picaresque—these are the great notes to which the author confines himself. Friars and priests frequently occur, but they are almost invariably rascals. Says Mr. Hutton: "The only son of Saint Francis illumined with light and piety is the confessor of Ser Ciappelletto, and he has no name and is, I fear, quickly forgotten."<sup>7</sup> He is indeed a mere foil to set forth the amazing cleverness and hypocrisy of the sinner whom he confesses and absolves.<sup>8</sup> The omission of religious stories may be accounted for by the fact that it was not until long after writing the *Decameron* that Boccaccio became a pietist; or it may be due to an artistic perception that stories of medieval saints would have sorted ill with a pleasure

<sup>6</sup> Henri Hauvette, *Boccaccio, Étude Biographique et Littéraire*, 1914, p. 212.

<sup>7</sup> Edward Hutton, *Giovanni Boccaccio, A Biographical Study*, 1910, p. 309.

<sup>8</sup> *Decameron*, First Day, First Story.

excursion where the mirth was frequently broad, and where the romantic tales centered generally about that passion of love toward which ecclesiastical tradition showed the profoundest aversion. It cannot be shown that the omission of any fable concerning beasts or birds was deliberately artistic, though I cannot but think the inclusion of such matter would have discorded with the tone of the *Decameron*. Furthermore the *Roman de Renard* owes much of its color to its burlesque of the Chansons de Gestes. With these the Italy of Boccaccio was losing acquaintance. Neither does the *Decameron* anywhere exhibit the spirit of burlesque.

"In Chaucer," says Mr. Hutton, the tales often weary us, but the tellers never do; in Boccaccio the tales never weary us, but the tellers always do." That the tellers in Boccaccio do not exactly weary us is solely due to the fact that they are used as a foil for the tales which are the real purport of the book. But even in the stories themselves action and situation are of vastly more account than the character of the personages. To describe a character of the *Decameron* you almost have to tell the story in which he appears. There is rarely a portrait, or a description of costume or manner of life. Personages are rarely visualized. It is only in the dialogues that we are at all apt to see individuality delicately rendered, and dialogue is not at all prominent as an instrument of narration.

The style of the *Decameron* is a remarkable achievement. The first commentator on Dante, and the first occidental man of letters since the dark ages to read either Homer or Tacitus, Boccaccio's personal history was of a nature to foster his natural instinct for style, and indeed in the *Teseide* style is almost the only merit. It is the weakness of Cicero, as he himself admitted, to be somewhat turgid and wordy, a defect which has frequently characterized modern Italian prose. It would therefore be unreasonable to expect of Boccaccio, a diligent student of Cicero, the Attic simplicity of another school. The style of the *Decameron* is somewhat complicated, but fortunately the author had now learned to mingle the directness and point of good conversation with his more artificial graces. And the *Decameron* gives us a style such as is rarely found in European prose from the dark ages until the sixteenth century or later.<sup>9</sup> It is immeasurably superior to the floridity of his early

<sup>9</sup> There is a large body of excellent prose in Old Icelandic. The Welsh

work which fairly wallows in fine writing, and it is equally superior to the awkwardness of Chaucer's prose treatises. Indeed, this last circumstance is a powerful argument that Chaucer never read the *Decameron*, or at least never made himself intimate with it. That he knew none of the other collections of framed tales which I have discussed I take for granted.

HENRY BARRETT HINCKLEY

New Haven, Conn.

---

### CHAUCEER AND THE *PERVIGILIUM VENERIS*

It has long been known that the beautiful lines which open the *Canterbury Tales* were derived by Chaucer in part from earlier sources. Similar descriptions of spring have been pointed out in Guido's *Historia Troiae*,<sup>1</sup> Vincent de Beauvais's *Speculum Naturale*,<sup>1</sup> Boccaccio's *Ameto*<sup>2</sup> and *Filocolo*.<sup>3</sup> This article presents yet another parallel.

The *Pervigilium Veneris* is an anonymous Latin poem, written about the second century A. D. to celebrate the festival of Venus, which was held during the first three days of April (cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, iv. 1-162). The poem, supposedly written on the eve of the festival, praises Venus (often calling her Dione) as the bringer of life-giving showers, the goddess of fertility, and the *copulatrix amorum* who gives to each creature its mate. All are summoned to appear at her court by the refrain which is repeated at intervals throughout the poem: *Cras amet qui numquam amavit, quique amavit cras amet*. Here follow the lines which especially resemble Chaucer:<sup>4</sup>

*Mabinogion* not infrequently has passages of peculiar beauty. But the merits of these monuments do not especially invite comparison with the prose of Boccaccio. Old Irish prose I am not competent to judge.

<sup>1</sup> Skeat's Chaucer, v. 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> J. S. P. Tatlock, "Boccaccio and the Plan of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*," *Anglia*, xxxvii (1913), 86-88. Professor Tatlock also includes the significant lines from Guido.

<sup>3</sup> J. L. Lowes, "The Franklin's Tale, The Teseide, and The *Filocolo*," *Modern Philology*, xv (1918), 707.

<sup>4</sup> My text and line numberings follow those of the edition by Cecil Clementi, Oxford Press, 1911. Mr. Clementi brings together in one volume



Whan that Aprille with his shoures  
sote

The droghte of Marche hath *perced*  
to the rote,

And bathed every *veyne* in swich  
*licour*,

Of which *vertu* engendred is the  
flour;

Whan *Zephirus* eek with his swete  
*breeth*

*Inspired* hath in every *holt* and  
*heeth*

The tendre croppes, and the yonge  
sonne

Hath in the Ram his halfe cours  
y-ronne,

And smale *fowles* maken *melodye*,  
That slepen *al the night* with open  
ye,

(So priketh hem nature in hir  
corages)

*Ipsa venas atque mentem permeanti*  
*spiritu*

*Intus occultis gubernat procreatrix*  
*viribus* (P. V. 16-17)

*Et nemus comam resolvit de maritis*  
*imbribus.* (P. V. 3)

*Ipsa surgentes papillas<sup>5</sup> de Favoni*  
*spiritu*

*Urget in toros tepentes.<sup>6</sup>*  
(P. V. 23-24)

*Et canoras non tacere diva iussit*  
*alites.* (P. V. 85)

*Detinenda est tota noctis pervigilia*  
*canticis.* (P. V. 58)

It is idle to insist that Chaucer drew his lines from this source rather than another, since we know that he read Guido's history and probably read one or both of the passages mentioned from Boccaccio. (Indeed, these authors may themselves have used the *P. V.* as a source). But Professor Lowes has repeatedly demonstrated for us the amazingly retentive and associative qualities of Chaucer's mind, which frequently combined in a single sentence material from half a dozen sources. Had Chaucer read the *Pervigilium Veneris*, he must inevitably have remembered it when writing the opening lines of the *Prologue*. There are several indications that he did so. First, his use of the word "veyne" (venas) and his description of the birds' song are more closely akin to the

the two extant Mss. of the poem, with facsimiles of the same, his reconstruction of the text, and a translation in verse form.

<sup>5</sup> *papillas*. There is a play on the meanings a) "a nipple on the breast," and b) "the bud of a flower." [Clementi's note.]

<sup>6</sup> *toros tepentes*. Clementi reads "nodos feraces." The earlier manuscript (ca. 8th cent.) reads "notos penates"; the later one (ca. 10th cent.) reads "totos pentes". I follow another editor (Nisard, *Collect. des auteurs latins*, Paris, 1878), in reading "toros tepentes", which is closer to the later manuscript and also to Chaucer's "holt and heeth."

*P. V.* than to the other passages mentioned. Second, the *P. V.* accounts for his dating the *Prologue* in the first days of April. The passages in both Guido and the *Ameto* date the beginning of spring from the sun's first entering the Ram, which in Chaucer's time would occur on March 12.<sup>7</sup> But Chaucer fixes his date after the sun's completion of the first half of its course in the Ram, which would bring him approximately to April 1.<sup>8</sup> This change is satisfactorily explained if we assume that Chaucer recalled lines in the *P. V.* similar to his own and remembered that the season which it celebrated began on the first of April.

I have also observed two other interesting verbal parallels. One occurs in the *Franklin's Tale*, F 907-8:

Which May had *peynted* with his softe shoures  
This gardin ful of leves and of *flowers*.

*Ipsa gemmis purpurantem pingit annum floridis.*

(*P. V.* 22)

The other is found in the *Parlement of Foules*, ll. 302-5:

And in a launde, upon an <i>hille of</i> <i>floures</i> ,	Cras Dione iura dicit <i>fula sublimi</i> <i>throno.</i> ( <i>P. V.</i> 6)
--	---

Was set this noble goddess Nature;	Iussit Hyblaeis tribunal stare <i>diva</i> <i>floribus</i> ( <i>P. V.</i> 61)
------------------------------------	--

Of <i>braunches</i> were hir <i>halles</i> and hir <i>boures</i> ,	Cras amorum copulatrix inter um- bras arborum
---	--

Y-wrought after hir craft and hir measure.	Implicat <i>casas virentes de flagello</i> <i>myrteo.</i> ( <i>P. V.</i> 4-5)
---	--

There is no passage similar to this in Alanus's *De Planctu Naturae*, from which Chaucer tells us that his description of Nature was taken.

<sup>7</sup> *Astrolabe*, II. 1, 12.

<sup>8</sup> I agree with Tatlock (*op. cit.*, p. 88), that it is a mistake to interpret Chaucer's lines as meaning the second half of the sun's course in the Ram, in order to make this date accord with that of April 18 given in the *Introduction to the Man of Law's Prologue*, ll. 5-6. It seems illogical to mention the date when April relieved the drought of March if more than half of April was already past. Nor would Chaucer be likely to give a date according to the sun's position in the Ram when the sun had already been nearly a week in the Bull, which it entered on April 11. More probably, Chaucer is following the *P. V.* in making April 1 the beginning of the spring season (or the season of showers), while dating his own journey by the rather general reference in l. 19, "in that season on a day."

It is possible that the *Parlement of Foules* is indebted to the *Pervigilium Veneris* for more than a verbal parallel. Certainly, Chaucer's portrait of Nature is closer to the *copulatrix amorum* of the Latin poem than to the sermonizing goddess, Natura, in Alanus's work. The obvious objection will be raised that Chaucer is writing of Nature, while the *P. V.* celebrates Venus. But Chaucer places Nature in the garden of Venus, for which he has a precedent in the *Roman de la Rose*. Jean de Meun's Nature, however, is far different from Chaucer's goddess who unites lovers in the connubial bonds and gives them desired happiness. The latter is much more like Venus, or Dione, in the *P. V.* A further parallel between the two poems is the attitude taken by their authors. Chaucer pictures himself as one to whom love is denied and who must watch the happiness of others. At the end of his poem the birds go off singing, while the author awakes and resumes his search for a knowledge of love. His lines should be read and compared with the following passage near the end of the *P. V.*:

Ecce! iam subter genestas explicant tauri latus,  
Quisquis tutus quo tenetur coniugale foedere.  
Subter umbras cum maritis, ecce! balantum greges;  
Et canoras non tacere diva iussit alites.  
Iam loquaces ore rauco stagna cygni perstrepunt:  
Adsonat Terei puella subter umbram populi,  
Ut putes motus amoris ore dici musico,  
Et neges queri sororem de marito barbaro.  
  
Illa cantat, nos tacemus. Quando ver venit meum?  
Quando fiam uti chelidon, ut tacere desinam? (*P. V.* 82-92)

In mood and situation, it seems to me that this passage has much in common with Chaucer's poem. With the other parallels noted, this shows at least a probability that Chaucer knew and used the *Pervigilium Veneris*.

JOHN E. HANKINS

University of Kansas

---

"ALLAS! ALLAS! THAT EVER LOVE WAS SINNE!"

Most readers of Chaucer, I suppose, interpret the Wife of Bath's exclamation, "Allas! allas! that ever love was sinne!"<sup>1</sup> as an ex-

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. W. W. Skeat, *The Canterbury Tales*, D, 614.

pression of the troubled emotion she feels for having enjoyed five husbands though she knows that neither the scholastics nor the early church fathers (particularly St. Jerome, whose arguments she adroitly turns and reverses to suit the needs of her own position)<sup>2</sup> look with favor upon multiple marriage. Another interpretation, which it is the purpose of this note to present, is possible and, I hope, acceptable; at any rate, it rather supplements than excludes the former interpretation.<sup>3</sup>

After the Wife of Bath has discussed marriage she discourses upon the free use of the generative organs and, praying God's sympathy if she be in error, concludes that she will hold her husband to paying his fleshly debt frequently.<sup>4</sup> So much did she insist upon the payment of this debt that she was the torture and dismay of her old husbands,<sup>5</sup> and her fifth husband's ability to pay it contributed in no small measure to her love for him.<sup>6</sup> She takes pleasure in the fact that her husbands told her she was sexually fit.<sup>7</sup> In all her references to sexual relationships, in fact, she exhibits a keen delight in fleshly indulgences, with no desire to limit them.

Such inordinate indulgence, however, is viewed by the early fathers and by the scholastics, if not as sinful, at least as undesirable. In the *Summa Theologica* the virtue of temperance may govern the pleasures of sexual intercourse;<sup>8</sup> continency, one of the fruits of the Holy Ghost, has to do with the desires of the concupiscible faculty.<sup>9</sup> Sins are present in man, it is said, due to the fact that he follows the inclination of his sensitive appetite against the order of his reason;<sup>10</sup> yet the guilt of a sin is lessened as the

<sup>2</sup> A particularly noteworthy instance is: *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, VI, "Against Jovinianus," I, 36, and *The Canterbury Tales*, D, 115-38. For Chaucer and St. Jerome, see: W. W. Woollcombe, "Sources of the Wife of Bath's Prologue," in *Essays on Chaucer, his Words and Works*, III (10), 293 ff.; T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 292-95.

<sup>3</sup> This note, furthermore, is not intended to relate to the discussion of Chaucer's architectonic use of the sins, for which see: F. Tupper, "Chaucer and the Seven Deadly Sins," *PMLA.*, XXIX (1914), 93-128, and "Chaucer's Sinners and Sins," *JEGP.*, xv (1916), 56-106; and J. L. Lowes, "Chaucer and the Seven Deadly Sins," *PMLA.*, xxx (1915), 237-371.

<sup>4</sup> *The Canterbury Tales*, D, 1-162.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 215 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 505 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 607 f.

<sup>8</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, ii, 60: 5.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, I, ii, 70: 5.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, I, ii, 71: 3.

impulse to sin is strengthened, although such impulse does not altogether excuse from sin if it does not render the act entirely involuntary.<sup>11</sup> Incontinency in marriage, moreover, is not assigned as a species of lust, since it is not connected with undue matter, but with other circumstances, which do not constitute the species of a moral act;<sup>12</sup> and the marriage act that is done out of sensuous pleasure is said to be a lesser sin than fornication, which, although it is a mortal sin, is said to be the least grievous species of lust.<sup>13</sup> St. Jerome, however, is more explicit; he disapproves of any sexual intercourse except for the procreation of children. He who loves his own wife too ardently is considered disgraceful. A wise man should love his wife with judgment, not with passion; he should govern his voluptuous impulses and not rush headlong into intercourse. “There is nothing blacker than to love a wife as if she were an adulteress.” Husbands and wives should dwell together according to knowledge, so that they may know what God wishes and desires, and that they may give honor to the weak vessel, woman. When a man abstains from intercourse, he honors his wife; when he does not abstain, it is evident that the opposite is true—he insults her. Wives, also, should let their husbands see their chaste behavior. As long as married persons revert to the practice in question in order that Satan may not tempt them, they are sowing to the flesh, and not to the spirit; “he who sows to the flesh reaps corruption.” Since the outer man is corrupt, and since married persons have ceased to possess the blessing of incorruption characteristic of virgins, these persons should at least imitate the incorruption of the spirit by subsequent abstinence and exhibit in the mind that which they cannot show in the body. As Christ loves the Church holily, chastely, and without spot, husbands should love their wives in chastity.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I, ii, 73: 6; and 77: 6-7.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, II, ii, 154: 1.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, II, ii, 154: 2 and 12.

<sup>14</sup> St. Jerome, *op. cit.*, I, 20, 49, 7, 38, 16.

Reginald Pecock, whose opinion regarding coition in marriage adumbrates that of John Milton in *Paradise Lost* (IV, 309 ff., 741 ff.) and the *Christian Doctrine* (*Prose Works*, IV, 225, 239 ff.), is the first churchman, so far as I know, materially to modify the attitude expressed by St. Jerome. In *The Reule of Crysten Religioun* (ed. W. C. Greet, *EEES.*, 171, 1927), while treating as unlawful fleshliness whose end is sensual delight only (III, viii), advising wedded persons to forbear coition except for the cause of God's

Since Jankin read to her from St. Jerome against Jovinian,<sup>15</sup> the Wife of Bath knows this father's attitude towards incontinency in marriage as well as towards multiple marriage. Even though she easily convinces the Pardoner with her skilful argument for the free use of the organs of generation, her own emotions do not accept it as cogent. At least it does not, she feels, vindicate her from the inordinate use of them, even within the bonds of marriage. In extenuation of both causes of uneasiness—incontinency and several marriages—she pleads her inclination due to astrological influences;<sup>16</sup> then exclaims pathetically:

Allas! allas! that ever love was sinne!  
 I folwed ay myn inclinacioun  
 By vertu of my constellacioun;  
 That made me I coude noght withdrawe  
 My chambre of Venus from a good felawe.<sup>17</sup>

*Southeastern Oklahoma College*

E. E. SLAUGHTER

service and to perceive the sensual delight as little as possible (III, viii), advising husband and wife not to abuse the privileges of wedlock (III, xxii) and to keep wedlock clean by avoiding bodily contact except when they hope to beget children (III, xxiii), Pecoock admits as lawful the use of fleshly creatures which stirs to God's service, and the purpose of which is only to stir to His service (III, viii), and does not advise husband and wife to vow abstinence though, he says, they should endeavor to attain it (III, xxiii). In treating the third point of the covenant in marriage (III, viii; xxi), he goes further. Although the desire of intercourse does not always indicate a need for it, although it is a sin if sought after too much and for reasons other than engendering and natural necessity, and although the married person seeking the fleshly deed may be guilty of venial sin if lust resulting from diet is the cause, husband and wife, who have the same rights and duties in fleshly deeds, should satisfy each other's ordinate desires and may, without sin, do fleshly deeds if they purpose to beget children or, without attempting contraception, to avoid sin or to remedy bodily sickness (III, xvii; xxi; xxii). He rejects as impractical an argument that intercourse is not necessary to prevent danger of sin or to cure sickness (III, xxii). It is because of His great reasonableness that God judges sinless marital intercourse that is not to beget children (III, xxii); nature and grace are not contrary, Pecoock concludes, but nature serves grace, and grace perfects nature (III, xxiii).

<sup>15</sup> *The Canterbury Tales*, D, 674-5.

<sup>16</sup> For explanation of this astrological influence, see Walter Clyde Curry, *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences*, 91 ff.

<sup>17</sup> *The Canterbury Tales*, D, 614-18.

CHAUCER'S AGE AND THE PROLOGUES TO  
THE LEGEND

In a reference to Dodd's treatment of the poet's attitude toward love in the prologue to the Legend of Good Women, D. D. Griffith in the Manly Anniversary Studies points out that the poet was an outsider in love in the A(G) version but was a worshipper of love in the B(F) version. To prove the poet's part in love in the B version, Griffith quoted from it "I fele yit the fyr," and "Loved no wight hotter in his lyve," but in A, ll. 400-1, Alceste said

Whyl he was yong, he kepte your estat;  
I not wher he be now a renegat.

Professor Griffith used these quotations to support his theory of Chaucer's changing attitude toward religion. A second conclusion might be inferred, namely: Chaucer was a younger man when he wrote the B version. This belief is strengthened by an examination of other lines of the A version. The god of love addresses the poet in ll. 261-2:

Wel wot I ther-by thou beginnest dote  
As olde foles whan hir spirit fayleth;

and again in ll. 314-6:

Although (that) thou reneyed hast my lay,  
As other olde foles many a day.

There is no reference to the poet as an "olde fole" in the B version. The fact that the poet owns books is mentioned in the B version, but "sixty bokes olde and newe hast thou thyself" appears only in the A version. On this we might base a supposition that he had accumulated more manuscripts since the previous writing.

This note does not attempt to enter the discussion concerning the reason for the revision, but through references to the age of the poet found in the two versions makes more conclusive the belief that the A version is the revision.

THELMA KAUT

*University of Kentucky*

---

## A NOTE ON NOAH'S WIFE

Dr. Millicent Carey in her study on the *Wakefield Group in the Towneley Cycle*,<sup>1</sup> has occasion to trace the story of Noah,<sup>2</sup> and she finds that the legend was widely spread in English Literature from the seventh to the fifteenth century,<sup>3</sup> and that a growing mass of traditional material attached itself to the Bible story.<sup>4</sup> The most interesting problem is that of the obduracy of Noah's wife in entering the ark; she behaves with that shrewishness of character that distinguished the *Wyf of Bath*, and presumably the wives of many other medieval guildsmen. Dr. Carey asserts that Uxor "appears as a speaking character for the first time in the plays";<sup>5</sup> she is mentioned in the Bible and her character is vaguely drawn in other sources, but only in the Towneley plan, the *Processus Noe cum filiis* is her shrewish and humorous character well developed. "How" asks Doctor Carey "did the idea of a stubborn Uxor evolve? Is her refusal to go into the ark the result of a gradual development of her character, or were the dramatists here following a tradition handed down to them from non-dramatic sources? Is she a purely English product?"<sup>6</sup> She finds nothing in English before the time of Chaucer who probably derived his ideas from the Mystery plays,<sup>7</sup> nothing to the point either in the French *Mistere du Viel Testament*, in the Cornish plays, or in Jewish legend, which should justify the traditional stubborn character of Uxor.<sup>8</sup> Her reconstruction of the manner in which Uxor developed her popular character is as follows:—

1. Noah's wife is mentioned by the Bible as one of the inhabitants of the ark.
2. The tradition is established that Noah's relatives mocked at him while he was building the ark (Cursor Mundi, ll. 1729-44; Cornish *Creation*, ll. 2293-33).
3. Noah's wife is introduced as a speaking character in the Cycle plays.
4. On analogy with the Adam and Eve story, the devil is intro-

<sup>1</sup> *The Wakefield group in the Towneley Cycle*, by M. Carey. Hesperia, Ergänzungsreihe, 1930. (Johns Hopkins Press.)

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 71 ss.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 66.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 76.



duced into the Newcastle *Noah's Ark* to tempt Uxor to make trouble for Noah.

5. The playwrights know the widespread tradition of the shrewish nature of woman and of the difficulties involved in the relations of husband and wife, which was expressed in popular literature of both France and England and took dramatic form in the French farces.
6. The author of the Cornish *Creation* recognises the dramatic possibilities of making Uxor hesitate to enter the ark because she wishes to save her household goods.
7. The trouble-motif of the Newcastle *Noah's Ark* is combined with the hesitation-motif of the Cornish *Creation* and with the shrew-motif so common in popular literature.<sup>9</sup>

There is, however, some evidence that the story of Noah's stubborn wife was popularly known before the Cornish or French plays were written. In the illustration on p. 66 of the Caedmonian MS Junius XI, there is a portrayal of the ark which gives details that are not in the text of the Caedmonian *Genesis*. Sir Israel Gollancz has already noticed the significance of the picture,<sup>10</sup> but since he presents his conclusions in the part of his work which deals with the manuscript, it is easy to overlook his conclusions. He says of this sketch:—"On the right hand, one of the women, whom we may assume to be Noah's wife, seems to be unwilling to mount the ladder, and is expostulating with one of the three sons." This interpretation of the picture had occurred to me before I read Sir Israel's note, and although it is possible that we were both misled by our knowledge of the Uxor of the Cycles, yet it seems likely that this picture shows a knowledge of the legend. The ark is evidently ready to put off. The animals are on board, two of Noah's sons and their wives are on board, Noah is at the helm, and the Deity is waiting to close the door, and is looking anxiously at the woman who is standing at the foot of the ladder or gangway on the right. The waters appear to be rising. A young man halfway up the ladder is beckoning the woman; and she remains at the foot, and spreads her hands in an expostulatory manner.<sup>11</sup> It does not seem fanciful to assume that the legend is known to

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

<sup>10</sup> *The Caedmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Poetry with introduction by Sir Israel Gollancz*, British Academy, 1927, p. xlv.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the reproduction of the illustration.

the artist, who is consistent in his additions of apocryphal and other material to the Biblical text.<sup>12</sup>

If this hypothesis be accepted, then the date and provenance of the manuscript are of importance. Sir Israel Gollancz places the part of it which contains this picture in the last quarter of the tenth or the early years of the eleventh century, and he gives the approximate date of 1000 A.D.<sup>13</sup> He adds in a footnote<sup>14</sup> that the scribe and the artist worked together, and that he cannot accept Professor C. R. Morey's view that the illustrations were added later. This latter's view still seems to me to be worthy of consideration; but since he fixes the date somewhere between 1000 and 1035<sup>15</sup> or thereabouts, this difference of opinion does not much affect the present discussion. Both scholars agree that the illustrations show the influence of the Rheims school which produced the Utrecht Psalter, and which is "the real ancestor of English art."

The importance of this for Noah's wife is that if the evidence of the illustration be accepted, then the stubbornness of Noah's wife was known in England between 1000 and 1035 A.D., before the Conquest, and long before any of Miss Carey's texts, and before the popular treatment of the shrewish wife had made any headway. The conclusion to be drawn is that the sources of the legend must be sought in the continental environment which produced the Rhenish school of art, or near Winchester where the Caedmon manuscript was probably made.<sup>16</sup> The probability is that the illustrator drew upon English sources, since the influence of continental style does not presuppose the influence of continental matter.

KATHERINE GARVIN

London, England

---

LYDGATE'S "THE CHURL AND THE BIRD," MS.  
HARLEY 2407, AND ELIAS ASHMOLE

I

Attention should be called to the text of Lydgate's poem "The Churl and the Bird"<sup>1</sup> in Brit. Mus. MS. Harley 2407,<sup>2</sup> fol. 76r

<sup>12</sup> The Caedmon MS, p. xxxiv.

<sup>13</sup> The Caedmon MS, pp. xviii-xix.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, footnote 1.

<sup>15</sup> *The Caedmon Poems*, C. W. Kennedy, George Routledge and Sons, 1916, pp. 190-191.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 188 ss.

<sup>1</sup> There is a Middle English prose version of this fable in the Worcester

to 90v,<sup>3</sup> because it is not mentioned in MacCracken's list of Lydgate manuscripts,<sup>4</sup> or in Miss Hammond's excellent edition of the poem.<sup>5</sup> The text is defective at the beginning, lacking the first four stanzas, but it contains in the same sequence all of the remaining stanzas as printed by Hammond. In addition to this, it has seven more stanzas which occur between stanzas 35 and 36, and one more between stanzas 40 and 41 of Hammond's text. Thus it agrees in regard to content (except for the first four missing stanzas) with the version printed by Ashmole in 1652, under the title of *Hermes Bird*.<sup>6</sup> Hammond evidently knew of Ashmole's text, but made no mention of these extra stanzas, probably because she regarded them as later interpolations, not finding them in any of the numerous Lydgate MSS. I print these eight stanzas below, following Harley 2407, and noting the important variants from Ashmole's text, not because they are of any exceptional poetic merit, but because they present several interesting problems which are discussed in the notes.

## II

(after Hammond's stanza 35)

- |   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | als y the abrayde here before                  | 83v |
|   | of a ston now that y hade                      |     |
|   | the wich now thow hast forlore                 |     |
|   | be al reson thow schuldys ben sad              |     |
| 5 | and in thi herte no byng glad                  |     |
|   | now chorle y the tel in my device              |     |
|   | y was reyred <i>and</i> bred in swete peradyce |     |

Cathedral MS. F. 172 translation of the *Disciplina Clericalis* of Petrus Alphonsus (ed. W. H. Hulme, *Western Reserve University Bulletin*, vol. 22), but it is short and does not illustrate the poem under consideration.

<sup>3</sup> For full description see *Cat. Harl. MSS.* II, 689. It is a collection of treatises and poems concerned with alchemy and magic, and the present poem was obviously included because of its discussion of a magic stone.

<sup>4</sup> Four interesting illuminations depicting the garden, the churl, and the bird, are on 76v, 77r, 77v, 78r, respectively.

<sup>5</sup> *EETS.* E. S. 107, liv.

<sup>6</sup> E. P. Hammond, *English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, pp. 103 ff. I use her text, which is mainly from MS. Longleat 258, as a basis of comparison.

<sup>7</sup> *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum*, London 1652, pp. 213 ff. This is likewise a collection of alchemical tracts and poems.

- Now mo namys y schal the tel  
 of my stone that y cal jagowns  
 10 and of his vertuis with his smel  
 þt ben so swete and so odeferus  
 with ennok and ely hath be[n] my servis  
 my swete songe þt sowndeth so scherpe  
 with angelles voyse that passeth eny harpe
- 15 The nigr[ul]in deamond þt ys in morienis sees  
 and the white charbonkkel þt rolleth in wave  
 the setryne reby of ryche degreys  
 that passeth the stonys of comen sawe  
 in the lapidery ys grownd by olde lawe  
 20 he passeth al stonys þt ys under hevyn  
 after the cownse of kynde be þe planetts sevyn  
 3yt ys for non cherle to have schu[c]h tresoure     84v  
 that exsedeth al stonys in the lapidery  
 and of all vertuis he bereth the flowre  
 25 with all joye and grace þt maketh man mery  
 that in this worlde schal neuer byn sory  
 now very cherle thow passeth thy gras  
 y am at my liberte evyn as y was
- Als clerkys fyndeth in the bybell  
 30 at paradys [y]latis whan he was cast  
 by an angel both fayre and styll  
 adowne kyng elysavnder there y prest  
 and of all stonys 3yt was y lest  
 soche stonys in place few ben ybrought  
 35 soroful ys þe cherle *and* hevyn in his þowt  
 Now more cherle 3yt tel y can     85r  
 and thow wolt to me take hede  
 the byrde of ermes ys my name  
 in al the worlde that ys so wyde  
 40 with gletereng of grace by euery syde  
 [W]hos[o] me myght have in his covertowre  
 he were rychcher than eny emperowre  
 Elysawnder the conquerowre my ston smot downe  
 upon his helm whan hit pyght  
 45 no more than a pese that ys so rownde  
 hit was there to no manys syght  
 that leyde so playne the manly knyht  
 now y tel the with melde stevyn  
 this myghty grace cam owte fro hevyn

(here follows Hammond's stanzas 36-40 inclusive)

- 50        Now chorle y have the here tolde 86v  
           my vertuys here with grete experience  
           h[i]t were to sume men better than golde  
           to þe hit ys no fructuis a sentence  
           a chepys croke to þe ys better þan a launce  
 55        adew now globbe with herte sore  
           in cherles clowchys com y neuer more

(here follows Hammond's stanza 41)

### III

- 9        *Jagouns.* The stone Hyacinthus, to which were ascribed various miraculous properties by medieval writers. See, for example, P. Studer and J. Evans, *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries* (Paris 1924), under subject index.
- 12        Enoch and Elijah are the two instances of translation given in the Old Testament (Gen. 5, 24; II Kings 2, 11; Nic. 20, 3). The bird is boasting of his association with miraculous events.
- 15        MS. nigrvin, A. *nigrum*. Black. [Lat. nigr—uin] *morienis*. Moorish.
- 19        *the lapidery.* I suggest that this refers to the most famous of medieval lapidaries, written in Latin hexameters by Marbode, who was Bishop of Rennes from 1067 to 1081. The first line of Marbode's poem reads as follows:
- "Evax, rex Arabum, legitur scripsisse Neroni" (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* 171, col. 1737), and in line 152 of his fable of the Cock and the precious stone (ed. Zupitza, *Archiv.* 85, 11), Lydgate speaks of "Evax" as an authority on stones. However it is possible that Lydgate knew another lapidary older than Marbode's which has been ascribed to a hypothetical "Evax." For a full discussion of this difficulty, see C. F. Buhler, *The Sources of the Court of Sapience* (Leipzig 1932), pp. 54 ff.
- A. *grown*
- 25        A. *yt*
- 29-32        I have not been able to trace this story of Alexander. Most of the medieval Alexander legends which I have consulted portray him hospitably received in heaven.
- 30        MS. *batis*, A. *yatis*.
- 38        *ermes.* Hermes Trismegistus, the mythical founder of alchemy. However Ashmole says (*op. cit.*, p. 467), "The whole *Work* is *Parabolicall*, and *Allusive*, yet truly *Philosophicall*: and the Bird (that entitles it) the *Mercury* of the *Philosophers* (whose vertues and properties are therein largely described). By the word *Chorle*, is meant the Covetous and

Ignorant Artist, the *Garden* is the *Vessel* or *Glasse*, and the Hedge the Furnace."

41 MS. hose, A. *hose*.

45 *pese*. A pea.

47 A. *knyght*.

54 i. e., "a shepherd's crook is more suited to you than a (knight's) lance."

55 *globbe*. A glutton. NED. quotes *Piers Plowman* B, 9, 60.

Yale University

R. H. BOWERS

---

NOTE ON GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH'S *HISTORIA  
REGUM BRITANNIAE* VI. 12 AND VI. 15.

In Book VI, Chapter 12,<sup>1</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth gives an account of the arrival of additional Saxon forces, in whose midst was Ronwen,<sup>2</sup> the daughter of Hengist. The latter celebrated this event and invited king Vortegirn to his house. After Vortegirn "... regis epulis refectus fuit ..." Ronwen appeared and greeted the king with words "lauerd King, Wasseil."<sup>3</sup> Vortegirn's interpreter made the meaning of this phrase clear to the king (Vocavit te *Dominum regem* . . .), and he asked the king to give the answer "Drincheil." Geoffrey, then goes on, saying that from this time on down to his own days the custom prevailed in Britain that at banquets "... qui potat ad alium dicit 'Wasseil,' qui vero post illum recipit potum respondet 'Drincheil.'"

Geoffrey, then, tried to make the meaning of these English words clear. But some French scribes or correctors who transcribed or corrected manuscripts of Geoffrey's *Historia* did not think so. Above the phrase "Lauerd King, Wasseil" we find in MS 92 of the École de Médecine in Montpellier a note by a different scribe: "*Domine rex, vive sanus*." Above "Drincheil" (Vortegirn's answer to Ronwen), we read: "*Bibe sana*."

While the English words were left in this manuscript, they were not left in others. In MS 882 in the Bibliothèque Municipale at

<sup>1</sup> In Faral's edition, Chapter 104.

<sup>2</sup> Of Ronwen's name the manuscripts of Geoffrey offer a great variety of variants, of which it will not be amiss to quote a few: Renwen, Norguem, Rowen, Rouwein, Roawen, Norwenna, Renwein.

<sup>3</sup> Some manuscripts read "Guesheil" and "Guesseil."

Douai and in MS 5233 Fonds latin, Bibliothèque Nationale they are practically left out and Latin is substituted instead. In place of "Lauerd King, Wasseil" the Douai manuscript reads "*Domine rex, ave, bibe,*" and Fonds latin 5233 reads "*Domine rex, vive sanus*" (the same reading as the Montpellier manuscript). "Drincheil," however, is left in the text of Fonds latin 5233, with a superscript by the original scribe "*bibe sana.*" In Douai "Drincheil" is omitted and in its place we have in the text "*bibe tu.*" In the passage of Geoffrey, cited above, "qui potat . . . respondet Drincheil," both "Wasseil" and "Drincheil" are omitted in the text and Latin is put in their place. For "Wasseil" we have "*Vis bibere?*" and for "Drincheil" "*Bibe tu et da mihi.*"

In Chapter 15 of the same book,<sup>4</sup> Geoffrey tells the story of Hengist's villainy and treachery. Hengist ordered his men to hide long daggers under their garments with which they were to kill the British upon hearing the signal "Nimed oure saxes." This phrase is in the text of the Montpellier manuscript, but above it another scribe added "*accipite vestros cultros.*" Although this phrase occurs twice in this chapter it is translated into Latin when it occurs for the first time.

In the Douai manuscript, where the phrase reads "Nemet oue xasas," the situation is reversed. When the phrase occurs the second time, it runs as follows in the text: "*Nemet oue xasas, quod est insurgite citius in eis.*"

From the above, it would seem, that the scribes and correctors of the above mentioned manuscripts made the attempt to acquaint their French readers with the Latin meaning of these English phrases.

JACOB HAMMER

Hunter College

## SHOULD THERE BE ANY PLURALS IN *OES*?

Publishers, writers, and pupils are bedeviled by the illogical *e* which is sometimes inserted before the *s* of the plurals of certain nouns that end in *o* preceded by a consonant. Dictionaries are in flat disagreement as to which of these nouns should have *os* plurals and which should have *oes* plurals. For example, if we look up

<sup>4</sup> In Faral's edition, Chapter 104.

*dado*, *dingo*, and *embargo* in the *Century*, we learn that only the *os* plurals are proper; but in the *International* only the *oes* plurals are given. According to the *Oxford* the only proper plurals of *proviso* and *stiletto* end in *oes*, but no other dictionary tolerates those plurals. The *Century* gives only *bubos*, but in its own text under *Plague* uses *buboes*. No dictionary gives *salvoes* as a correct plural, yet five of the quotations in the *Oxford* show *salvoes*. The more one compares these inconsistencies the more strongly he concludes that they are not occasioned by either knowledge or good logic. There is some evidence that lexicographers are impelled by prejudice: the *Century* and Fowler strongly favor *os*; the *Oxford* and the *International* consistently prefer *oes*. An example of strong dislike of *os* can be seen under *i*, where there are only four nouns that have disputed plurals: *imago*, *indigo*, *innuendo*, *intermezzo*. The *International* gives *imagoes* and *indigoes*, which are not given by any other dictionary; it gives only *innuendoes*, though all the other dictionaries give the *os* plural and three prefer it; it gives only *intermezzi*, though *os* is given by three other dictionaries.

No thorough examination of these plurals has ever been made. Fowler, who shows more knowledge and good sense about them than is recorded in any other book of reference, speaks thus: "Although there are several hundred nouns in *o*, the ending is one that is generally thought to be exotic, and the plural in *oes*, which is shown by its being indispensable with the most familiar words to be the normal form, is allowed to only a small minority, most words having *os*." His statement at least intimates half of the truth.

The whole truth is that the *Century* enters more than 1500 nouns which end in *o* preceded by a consonant. This number could not be made less by any normal system of counting, but could be increased legitimately by adding compounds and variants. The nouns are a motley host: Spanish names of animals and plants, Italian terms for art and music, names of coins and genera, obsolete words. Only a person of extraordinarily wide knowledge has ever encountered more than three hundred of them in his reading. Some have no plurals; some have only foreign plurals.

Only 75 of the 1500 nouns are said by any dictionary to have *oes* plurals. By "any dictionary" I mean only *Oxford*, *Century*,



*Fowler, International, and Standard.* By "said" I mean the definite recommendation of *oes* as either a first or a second choice. I have been informed by the offices of the three American dictionaries that when no plural is given *os* is understood; this is obviously true in general, but may not have been strictly followed in every case. The list of the 75 nouns is as follows: *ambuscado, archipelago, armadillo, bastinado, bilbo, bravado, bravo, bubo, bufalo, calico, cargo, catalo, commando, crusado, dado, dago, desperado, dido, dodo, domino, dominoes* (the game), *echo, embargo, fiasco, flamingo, fresco, gecko, ginkgo, go, grotto, halo, hero, hobo, imago, indigo, innuendo, jingo, jo, lasso, ling, magnifico, mango, manifesto, memento, mirligoes, Morisco, mosquito, motto, mulatto, negro, no, outgo, palisado, palmetto, paterero, peccadillo, pintado, portico, potato, proviso, salvo, stalko, stiletto, strappado, stucco, sybo, tomato, tornado, torpedo, tyro, vertigo, veto, virago, volcano, zero.*

Most of these nouns are old and have familiar plurals. The three most recent ones are *hobo, dago*, and the plural of *jingo*, the earliest quotations for which in the *Oxford* are dated 1891, 1888, and 1878. No noun added in the *Century* Supplement of 1909 has an *oes* plural; neither has any noun in the *International* Addenda of 1924. (Twenty of these Addenda nouns are not in the *Century*.)

Of the list of 75 nouns that may have an *oes* plural 14 are either obsolete or very unusual. Ten more of them have *oes* plurals only by grace of the solitary judgment of the *International*, which is opposed by the other four dictionaries: *armadillo, catalo, fiasco, ginkgo, imago, indigo, ling, palmetto, strappado, stucco.* Thus there are only 51 nouns that are serious candidates for an "indispensable" plural in *oes*. Definite dictionary warrant can be cited for an *os* plural of 40 of these. Hence no one is required to write *oes* plurals except for 11 words: *dominoes* (the game), *echo, go, hero, jo, negro, no, potato, tomato, tornado, torpedo.*

There is no good reason for believing that even these *oes* plurals are sacred or indispensable. The *Saturday Evening Post*, which is most scrupulously conformed to an office style and which in general favors *oes*, has printed *dominos* for the game. The *Oxford*, which so often omits any reference to possible *os* plurals (e. g., not mentioning *provisos*), takes pains to say of the plural of *echo*, "rarely *echos*." The singular of *hero* was so commonly *heroe* in the 17th

and 18th centuries that *heroes* was not entirely a plural of an *o* noun. Out of seven plurals of *negro* in the *Oxford* quotations four are *negros*. One *Oxford* quotation has *potatos*; the singular was often *potatoe* even into the 19th century. The *Oxford* notes that the usual 18th-century plural of *tomato* was *tomatos*. Poutsma includes in his list of nouns that may have either *os* or *oes* plurals *tornado* and *torpedo*.

It seems improbable that a busy world will continue for many more decades to allow itself to be pestered with *oes*. An interesting effort to be free from *oes* was made by the Princeton Press in 1925, when it announced in its *Handbook of Style* the rule that only *s* was to be added to *o* nouns: *altos*, *cargos*, *potatos*. So much objection was raised by authors and patrons that in 1930 the Press withdrew from its advanced position. But the fact that the position was taken and was maintained for several years is a portent. The unreasonable and archaic *oes* need never be used by a writer who has a bit of courage.

HENSHAW WARD

*Hendersonville, N. C.*

---

### STIR AND CHIVE

As an outside instructor at the Maryland Penitentiary and a dabbler in slang, I have read with much interest Dr. Pound's suggestion that the Old English *styr* be considered as the origin of the underworld word *stir* 'prison.'<sup>1</sup>

J. C. Hotten in his slang dictionary published in 1859, suggests the possibility of the Anglo-Saxon *styr* as the origin of *stir*.<sup>2</sup> Farmer and Henley seem to lean towards the Gypsy *stiraben* as the root of the word.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Irving Brown of Columbia University is in favor of the Gypsy word *steripen* 'prison' as the source of *stir*. He says, in a communication to me on the subject, "I am sure the word *stir* for penitentiary is from the Gypsy. Using the word *pen* themselves the prisoners soon caught on to *steripen*, the Anglo-American Gypsy word for jail, and shortened it."

<sup>1</sup> *MLN.*, XLVI (1931), 154-5.

<sup>2</sup> J. C. Hotten, *A Dictionary of Modern Slang, Cant and Vulgar Words*. London, 1859.

<sup>3</sup> Farmer and Henley, *A Dictionary of Slang and Colloquial English*. London and New York, 1921.

*Staripen*,<sup>4</sup> *steripen*,<sup>5</sup> and *stiraben*<sup>6</sup> have all been given as spellings of the Romani word for 'prison.' When these variations are taken into account, the Gypsy origin of *stir* is quite acceptable phonetically. The proper pronunciation of the word as used at the present time is 'stûr.' As the earliest use of *stir* given in Farmer and Henley is 1851, it seems much more plausible that the word should have originated from a contemporary source such as the Romani, rather than from the Old English *styr* which disappeared centuries ago.

Hotten, in the 1860 edition of his dictionary, gives *sturabin* (p. 10) and *sturaban* (p. 231) as underworld words for 'prison,' but associates the words with the Gypsy *distarabin* 'prison,' keeping them distinct from *stir* which he suggests as originating from Anglo-Saxon *styr*. Matsell gives the word as *sturbin* 'state prison.'<sup>6</sup> Farmer and Henley list both *sturiben* and *sturibin*. If any change in the spelling of *stir* be attempted, 'stur' would seem to be more acceptable than 'ster.' Not only does it have its precedent in the first syllable of each of the above slang words, but also there would be less chance of phonetic confusion.

Another cant term which may have come from the Romani is *chive* 'knife.' This word first noted in 1673 (N.E.D.) is still in use at the present time. The preferred spelling is *chive*, but it is often given as *chivvy*, *chiv*, *shiv*, or *shive*. The pronunciation is either 'shiv' (rhyming with 'to live') or 'shivvy.' There is a Gypsy word *chivomengro*<sup>5</sup> 'knife,' whose stem 'chiv' suggests itself as the origin of the underworld *chive*.

J. LOUIS KUETHE

*The Johns Hopkins University Library*

## EARLY EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY LITERARY RELATIONS BETWEEN ENGLAND AND GERMANY

Some allusions to English literary figures of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in an oration entitled *De Charlataneria Erudi-*

<sup>4</sup> George Borrow, *Romano Lavo-Lil*. London, 1874.

<sup>5</sup> Smart and Crofton, *The Dialect of the English Gypsies*. London, 1875.

<sup>6</sup> George W. Matsell, *Vocabulum; or, the Rogue's Lexicon*. New York, 1859.

*torum*, delivered by J. B. Menken<sup>1</sup> before the combined students, faculty, and townsfolk of Marburg on February 9, 1713,<sup>2</sup> give interesting evidence of the literary relationship between England and Germany at that time. Since the oration was a semi-popular piece intended for the entertainment of the visiting Maurice William, Duke of Saxony,<sup>3</sup> as well as for the citizens of Marburg, it would be expected that the references would not be obscure to the auditors unless the orator intended to convict himself of just what he was condemning.

Menken's first reference is to Dryden, of whom he says,

"Et saepius conquestus est nostra etiam aetate tersissimus inter Anglos Poeta, Joannes Drydenius, ea ipsa dramata, quae Viris in hac arte exercitissimis praelecta placuissent, postquam in scenam ducta fuissent, plausores admodum paucos vel nullos invenisse."<sup>4</sup>

His second reference is to Thomas Fuller, whom he discusses along with other historians.

"Alii, ut Thomas Fullerus, celebratissimus Historicus Anglus, Libros suos plurimis voluminibus partiuntur, singulisque singulos praeponent Principes aut Optimates, a quibus lucelli quippiam aucupantur. Et quis credat, deprehendi etiam, qui sibi ipsis foetus proprios plenius titulis inscribunt?"<sup>5</sup>

His reference to Boyle and Bentley is less remarkable, since they might be known on the continent for their part in the discussion of the relative values of the old and new literatures.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mencke, to give the original spelling, was an ancestor of H. L. Mencken; the name was Latinized *Menckenius* and afterwards shortened to its present form. A translation of this work, the first into English, has been made by Dr. Francis E. A. Litz. Mr. Mencken informs us that he expects to publish it soon, with a biographical account of J. B. Mencke.—THE EDITORS.

<sup>2</sup> J. B. Menken, *De Charlataneria Eruditorum* (Amsterdam, 1716), p. ii.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 194.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>6</sup> As early as 1716, a pamphlet was printed at Leipzig titled *Beschreibung des Landes der Alten und Neuern und des zwischen ihnen entstandenen Krieges*. On page 3 of the *Vorberichte* is found this interesting reference: "Der Hr. Fontenelle hat auch selbst in Engelland Widerspruch gefunden. Denn wieder ihn und den Verfasser der *Theoriae Telluris*, Th. Burnet, ist des Herrn Tempels Vertheidigung der Alten gerichtet, die der Herr Wotton in einem besondern Buche wiederleget, aber desswegen von dem Herrn D. Swift in einer allegorischen *piece* etwas spitzig angegriffen und auch von dem Herrn Tempel selbst wiederleget worden."

"Et dici quidem vix potest, quantum istae eruditorum contentiones tum ad excitanda ingenia, tum ad ornanda literarum studia valeant: id quod nuper Caroli Boylii maxime & Richardi Bentleji lite patuit, quae ut ex levi admodum causa nata erat, attamen, cum ab utraque parte omnes ingenii vites intenderentur, foetus longe elegantissimos produxit."<sup>7</sup>

Menken's last allusion is contained in his section on satirists, and it indicates that by 1713 the fame of the Partridge pamphlets had reached Germany.

"... quin potius hominem novum producam, Isaacum Bickerstaff, Anglorum, qui sive serio, sive ut vesanae hominum curiositati illuderet, tot portentosas summorum Principum mortes eodem anno annuntiare ausus, non Angliam modo, verum & Orbem universum diu anxium tenuit & sollicitum."<sup>8</sup>

DON CAMERON ALLEN

*State College of Washington*

### POE'S *POLITIAN* AND GOETHE'S *MIGNON*

In connection with the recent performances at the University of Virginia and at Goucher College of Edgar Allan Poe's *Politian*, it may be of interest to point out an unquestionable Goethean influence in that work, which as yet has not been mentioned.

In the fourth of the "Scenes from *Politian*"<sup>1</sup> in which Politian tells Lalage of his deep love for her, she suggests to escape with him to America after he has killed her betrayer. She speaks of this country in lines which are too similar in form as well as in content to the description of Italy in *Mignon* to deny Goethean influence:

Knowest thou the land  
With which all tongues are busy—a land new found—  
Miraculously found by one of Genoa—  
A thousand leagues within the golden west?

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 101. When the oration was edited for the press, a note was appended to this reference which indicated that Menken or his editor related the name Bickerstaff to the Tatler papers. The reference in the oration is obviously to the Partridge papers; however, the mention of the Tatler as early as 1716 is significant.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Harrison, *The Complete Works of E. A. Poe* (New York, 1902), VII, 59-79.

A fairy land of flowers, and fruit, and sunshine,  
And crystal lakes, and over-arching forests,  
And mountains, around whose towering summits the winds  
Of Heaven untrammelled flow—which air to breathe  
Is Happiness now, and will be Freedom hereafter  
In days that are to come?

Politian replies in the same vein:

O, wilt thou—wilt thou  
Fly to that Paradise—my Lalage, wilt thou  
Fly thither with me? There Care shall be forgotten  
And Sorrow shall be no more, and Eros be all.  
.  
.  
.  
.  
.  
.  
.  
My all;—oh, wilt thou—wilt thou, Lalage,  
Fly thither with me?

The same spirit is evident in the selection which Lalage reads in Scene II:

It in another climate, so he said,  
Bore a bright golden flower, but not i' this soil!  
No lingering winters there, nor snow, nor shower—  
But Ocean ever to refresh mankind  
Breathes the shrill spirit of the western wind.

Carlyle's translation of *Wilhelm Meister* which contained *Mignon* was published in 1824. In the first edition his translation of the lyric reads:<sup>2</sup>

Know'st thou the land where the lemon-trees bloom?  
Where the gold-orange glows in the deep thicket's gloom?  
Where a wind ever soft from the blue heaven blows,  
And the groves are of laurel and myrtle and rose?  
Know'st thou it?

Thither! O thither,  
My dearest and kindest, with thee would I go.  
Know'st thou the house, with its turretted walls,  
Where the chambers are glancing, and vast are the halls?  
Where the figures of marble look on me so mild,  
As if thinking: "Why thus did they use thee, poor child?"  
Know'st thou it?

Thither! O thither,  
My guide and my guardian, with thee would I go.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship. From the German of Goethe.* Edinburgh, 1824, I, 229.

Know'st thou the mountain, its cloud-covered arch,  
 Where the mules among mist o'er the wild torrent march?  
 In the clefts of it, dragons lie coil'd with their brood;  
 The rent crag rushes down, and above it the flood.  
 Know'st thou it?

Thither! O thither,  
 Our way leadeth: Father! O come let us go!

Comparing the two poems more closely, we find the following points of agreement:

1. Description of the land by means of questions.
2. Long enumeration of objects and characteristics found in the land.
3. Increasing intensity of the longing to go to that land.
4. Both poems begin with the question: "Knowest thou the land" and both end with an urgent plea to fly to that land.

Goethe's *Mignon* had appeared in English translations twenty-one times<sup>3</sup> before *Politian* was written, and three of these editions had been published in American magazines.<sup>4</sup> Since Poe himself was a magazine editor, it is quite probable that he saw the poem in one of these magazines. But even aside from this there can be no doubt that Poe was acquainted with Goethe's life and work and that he had at least a reading knowledge of German.<sup>5</sup> On one occasion he said: "Do not touch upon my poor life. Question Goethe who was a prince and could afford six stallions with which to tear through the world."<sup>6</sup> With regard to *Werther* he remarks: "The title, by the way, is mistranslated—*Leiden* does not mean sorrows, but sufferings."<sup>7</sup> His *Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque* even bear a motto taken from Goethe's *Die Göttin*.

The Goethean influence pointed out here appears strange if we consider Mr. Briggs' remark in a letter to Lowell: "Poe is a monomaniac on the subject of plagiarism, and I thought it best to allow him to ride his hobby to death in the outset and be done

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lucretia Simmons, *Goethe's Lyric Poems in English Translation Prior to 1860*. Univ. of Wisconsin Studies, No. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *North American Review*, iv, 201; again xix, 316. *Athenaeum* (Boston), xi, 144.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Gruener, "Poe's Knowledge of German," *MP.*, iv, 125.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. H. H. Ewers, *E. A. Poe*, p. 34.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Ingram, *The Works of Poe* (London, 1899), iii, 477.

with it.”<sup>8</sup> Mr. Briggs, editor of the *Broadway Journal*, was referring to the series of articles on “Longfellow and Other Plagiarists,” which appeared in the *Journal* and in which Poe among other things accused Longfellow of stealing a scene from *Politian* for his own drama *The Spanish Student*. Longfellow did not take an active part in the “Plagiarism War,” but when we recall that Longfellow was rather intimately acquainted with German literature—he was a student at Göttingen for some time—it seems that this Goethean influence would not have escaped his notice, especially not if he used a scene from *Politian* as model for his *Spanish Student*, an argument which Longfellow, or his friend “Outis,” might have used to advantage in answering Poe’s charges. Certainly there is more resemblance between the sections collated above than there is in the case of *Politian* and *The Spanish Student*, consequently more reason to suspect Poe of “plagiarism”—according to Poe’s own definition of the term—than his rival, Longfellow.

KARL J. ARNDT

Hartwick College

---

#### THE DATE OF COMPOSITION OF *THE BORDERERS*

When Wordsworth first published *The Borderers* in 1842 he informed his readers in the preface that the play had been written during the years 1795-6. About the same time he repeated the assertion in a letter to Henry Reed, and told Moxon, his publisher, that it was composed in his “twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth years.” In the note afterwards dictated to Miss Fenwick he was more precise—“It was composed at Racedown, in Dorset, during the latter part of the year 1795, and in the following year.” Without doubt then, in 1842-3, almost half a century after the event, Wordsworth had it firmly in mind that he had written *The Borderers* in 1795-6.

Editors, commentators and biographers, Christopher Wordsworth,<sup>1</sup> Professor Knight,<sup>2</sup> Thomas Hutchinson,<sup>3</sup> Professor Har-

<sup>8</sup> Cf. J. W. Krutch: *Edgar Allan Poe*. New York, 1926, p. 145.

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, I, p. 96 (Boston, 1851).

<sup>2</sup> *Poetical Works*, IX, p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> W. Wordsworth, *Poetical Works*, Oxford ed., p. xxvii.



per,<sup>4</sup> Sir Walter Raleigh<sup>5</sup> and Professor De Selincourt<sup>6</sup> have all accepted the date, evidently without question. Professor Legouis, remembering that the first reference to the finished play occurs in a letter of 1797, puts the date of composition "between 1795 and 1797."<sup>7</sup> Professor Garrod on the other hand, with a theory of the tragedy to be defended, is strong for the earliest possible date—" *The Borderers* was begun in the autumn of 1795 when he settled in Dorset. It was then that Wordsworth first became an out-and-out Godwinian. It is important to arrive at this definition of time, since M. Legouis has argued that *The Borderers* is to be regarded as the beginning of Wordsworth's revolt against Godwin."<sup>8</sup>

I hope to show that the date of 1795-6 which Wordsworth in his old age believed to be the correct one, and which has been generally accepted, is wrong by a year, and that *The Borderers* was begun in the autumn of 1796 and finished in the following spring.

Let us examine the contemporary evidence. On November 20, 1797 Dorothy Wordsworth wrote to an unknown correspondent, "William's play is finished, and sent to the managers of Covent Garden theatre. We have not the faintest expectation that it will be accepted."<sup>9</sup> Evidently she referred to a fair copy of the play with revisions, for *The Borderers* had been finished after a fashion by the first week of the previous June when Coleridge made his visit to Racedown.<sup>10</sup>

The date of the beginning of composition presents the difficulty. So far as I am aware there are only two items of contemporary evidence, ruling out the dubious argument from the mood of the play. First, there is the fragment from a letter by Dorothy dated October 24, 1796 and quoted by Christopher Wordsworth in the *Memoirs* in which she says that her brother is "now ardent in the composition of a tragedy."<sup>11</sup> Secondly, there is the undated letter to Francis Wrangham, No. XLIII in Knight's collection, in

<sup>4</sup> *Life of W. Wordsworth*, I, 251.

<sup>5</sup> *Wordsworth*, p. 58.

<sup>6</sup> *Nineteenth Century*, Nov. 1926, p. 723.

<sup>7</sup> *Early Life of W. Wordsworth*, p. 269.

<sup>8</sup> *Wordsworth*, (1927), p. 90.

<sup>9</sup> *Letters*, I, 112.

<sup>10</sup> *Letters of S. T. Coleridge* (E. H. Coleridge ed.), I, 220.

<sup>11</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 96.

which Wordsworth says he has nearly finished the first draft of his tragedy. Since this letter to Wrangham affords the crux of the argument, I quote it at considerable length.

My dear Wrangham,

Your letter was very acceptable. I have done wrong in not replying to it sooner; if precedents would excuse me I would follow Mr. Pitt's rule, and take them from my own conduct; you also might furnish me with some additional store. . . .

If your poems are published I should have liked to have had a copy. I have been employed lately in writing a tragedy—the first draught of which is nearly finished. Let me hear from you very soon and I do promise—not a Godwynian, Montaguian, Lincolnian, promise—that I will become a prompt correspondent. This letter will do as well as a collection of rebuses and enigmas.

As I suppose patience is a topic upon which you occasionally harangue from the pulpit, I recommend it to you to put this letter in your pocket next Sunday, and collect your parishioners under the reading desk, or under the old yews in the Church yard, if more convenient, and (giving it to them) set your arms akimbo, and contemplate its open Christian operation upon their tempers. God bless you. Adieu.

W. Wordsworth.

Basil is well.

I was going to conclude, but I have found another piece of blank paper. On the other side you will find, or have found, something about a promise to (be) faithful in writing to you. This I repeat, in spite of Mr. Pitt's additional duty. The copy of the poem you will contrive to frank; else, ten to one, I shall not be able to release it from the post office. I have lately been living upon air, and the essence of carrots, cabbages, turnips, and other esculent vegetables,—not excluding parsley, the produce of my garden. . . .

Your poems, What is become of them? It is no disgrace to a man in the moon not to know what is doing here below, and then I do not think the worse of this because I have not heard of them, for we have neither magazine, review, nor any new publication whatever. . . ."

"I have been employed lately in writing a tragedy—the first draught of which is nearly finished." When was this letter written? Professor Knight said 1795, evidently for two reasons: Wordsworth himself asserted that the tragedy was begun in that year, and besides, in the letter there is a reference to Wrangham's *Poems*, 1795, which Knight believed were published in the year indicated on the title page.

Concerning Wordsworth's assertions that his play was written in 1795-6 it need only be said that they all belong to the years 1842-3 when Wordsworth was an old man and quite capable of making a slight mistake of memory and repeating it. As for Wrangham's *Poems*, although they have (1795) on the title-page and so might seem to substantiate an early date for Letter XLIII it can be proved conclusively that they could not have been printed or published in the year indicated. The British Museum has a copy of two different versions of these poems both with the title-page as follows.

Poems: / By / Francis Wrangham, M. A. / Member of Trinity-College, / Cambridge. / (Device) / (Quotation from Greek lines by Tweddell) / London: / (1795) / Sold by J. Mawman, 22, Poultry.

One version (4372 i. 24) has an Advertisement and Preface, the other (1465 b. 43) only an Advertisement. Both versions, however, on page 17 have a footnote reporting the division in the House of Commons on March 16, 1796 on the slave trade,<sup>12</sup> and both have on the last page of the volume this notice.

Lately Published / by / The Same Author, / Rome is Fallen! / A / Sermon.

Again the British Museum has a copy of this sermon, (4476 i 37) and it was published in 1798! The title-page reads:

Rome is Fallen! / A / Sermon; / preached at / The Visitation, / Held at Scarborough, / June 5, 1798. / By Francis Wrangham / . . . York . . . 1798.

The date (1795), then, on the title-page of Wrangham's *Poems* is worthless as indicating when the volume was either printed or published. The British Museum copies could not have been printed, at least in their present form, earlier than the autumn of 1798 after the sermon had been both delivered and printed. Further, a criticism of the volume appeared in the *Monthly Review* for January 1804, and the reviewer remarked, "though the title-page bears the date 1795, this volume was not published (or at least did not reach us) till lately."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> This note was first called to my attention by Professor J. L. Lowes.

<sup>13</sup> Pp. 82-5. Some copies had probably been given to friends before general publication, e. g. the one at Harvard with "Southey 1799" on the title-page.

The date of Wrangham's *Poems*, then, affords a bibliographical problem which I make no pretence of solving. In the preface the author says, "With regard to the following collection of Poems, I have little to premise. The greatest part of them were printed in the latter end of the year 1795, on which account that date is adopted in the title-page; but other, and (it is trusted) better employments have suspended their publication." Yet considering the dated footnote on page 17 and the notice at the back, the volume could hardly have been printed before 1798.<sup>14</sup> So Wordsworth's letter cannot be dated on the authority of this anomalous title-page. He might have wondered quite as well in 1796 or 1797 what had become of Wrangham's *Poems*.<sup>15</sup>

From attacking Knight's reasons for believing that Letter XLIII was written in 1795, we may turn to prove that it was late in 1796 or early in 1797. There are at least six items of internal evidence in the letter. First, there is the reference to Pitt's increase in the postage rates. Now the first important alteration in the postal tariff after 1784 was in 1796 when the rates were increased considerably. The bill was discussed in Parliament in December of that year, received royal assent on the 28th of the month, and went into force on January 5, 1797.<sup>16</sup> The letter then must have been written late in 1796 when the change was announced or more probably early in 1797 when it was in force. Secondly, in a letter to Wrangham of March 7, 1796 Wordsworth says, "I am glad to hear of your projected volume." Almost certainly this is the volume discussed at length above. Therefore Letter XLIII in which Wordsworth is wondering if it is published yet must be later than March 1796 when it was only 'projected.' Next, it seems impossible on other grounds to fit Letter XLIII into the

<sup>14</sup> I cannot account for Wrangham's meaning in the preface. By "the greatest part of them" he may mean *The Restoration of the Jews* the first and longest poem in the volume which had been published separately in 1795. In the same year had appeared another of his college poems, *The Destruction of Babylon*.

<sup>15</sup> Wordsworth, it may be remembered, had a personal interest in the volume. It contained his translation from the French "When Love was born of heavenly line."

<sup>16</sup> See *London Gazette*, No. 13966, Dec. 28, 1796. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1796, p. 1112. Herbert Joyce, *History of the Post Office*, p. 318. J. C. Hemmeon, *The History of the British Post Office*, p. 147.

Wordsworth-Wrangham correspondence except after March 1796. When it was written Wordsworth had failed to answer for a long time and Wrangham too had been remiss, that is, there had occurred a wide gap between Letter XLIII and the last one by Wordsworth. Now there are extant letters from Wordsworth to Wrangham dated Nov. 20 (1795), and March 7, (1796). Letter XLIII could not have preceded the one of Nov. 20 which is obviously the first from Racedown, nor can it be fitted in between the two for lack of room. Besides it mentions neither the expected visit by Basil Montagu nor the actual visit by the Pinneys, two main items of news during the Christmas season of 1795. Wrangham was a close friend of both Montagu and the Pinneys. So it must be after March 1796, and according to Wordsworth's confession, long after. Fourthly, there is the reference to Wrangham's parishioners. Now so far as I am aware Wrangham was without a benefice from the time when he left Cobham, Surrey, to come up to London early in 1795, until he was appointed to his Yorkshire parishes about the end of the same year. Writing on March 7, 1796 Wordsworth had just heard of Wrangham's induction.<sup>17</sup> Therefore Letter XLIII in which he offers himself as an object-lesson in patience for Wrangham's parishioners must be later. Fifthly, the sneer about Montaguian promises indicates a late date. Montague had been expected to visit Racedown any time after November 1795 and didn't put in an appearance until March 1797. Besides, he was paying nothing toward the support of his son whom the Wordsworths had taken to Racedown as a pupil. By the end of 1796 Wordsworth's patience might well be exhausted. Finally, there is the reference to the delicacies on which the Racedown household was subsisting, "air, and the essence of carrots, cabbages, turnips, and other esculent vegetables,—not excluding parsley, the produce of my garden," suggesting autumn or winter fare. This and other references to poverty in the letter should be compared with the new information contained in a recent article<sup>18</sup> which shows that in the winter of 1796-7 the Wordsworths were particularly hard up. From all this evidence, and particularly from the reference to the increased postal rate I feel sure that the letter was

<sup>17</sup> *Letters*, I, 101.

<sup>18</sup> Bergen Evans and Hester Pinney, "Racedown and the Wordsworths," *RES.*, Jan. 1932, pp. 1-18.

written some time between the beginning of December 1796 and the end of February 1797.

If this date be accepted the history of the writing of *The Borderers* is clear. When on October 24, 1796 Dorothy reported her brother "now ardent in the composition of a tragedy," he had no doubt just begun, and was ardent with the first enthusiasm. When Wordsworth wrote to Wrangham a few months later he had made progress—"I have been employed lately in writing a tragedy—the first draught of which is nearly finished". When Coleridge arrived early in June it was complete.

It is not necessary to discuss at length the difference which this later date makes on the autobiographical interpretation of *The Borderers*. However, one or two points should be noted. If, as I feel sure, the tragedy was not begun until the autumn of 1796, the creator of Oswald and Marmaduke, or rather of Rivers and Mortimer, as they were called in the first version, was no disciple of William Godwin. That phase had probably reached both its climax and its conclusion in 1795. By 1796 he was burning no incense before Godwin. In March Basil Montagu, the prophet's friend and ardent disciple, sent a copy of the second edition of *Political Justice* damp from the press down to Racedown expecting it to be received and studied as authentic truth by a devout follower; instead, it was criticised by an apostate with an eye for faults. "I have received from Montagu, Godwyn's second edition. I expect to find the work much improved. I cannot say that I have been encouraged in this hope by the perusal of the second preface, which is all I have yet looked into. Such a piece of barbarous writing I have not often seen. It contains scarce one sentence decently written."<sup>19</sup> This is not the language of devotion. Besides, in the same year there appeared an increasing dislike for that practising Godwinian, Montagu. One may be sure that as Wordsworth re-read *Political Justice* during the spring and summer of 1796 it was with a growing hatred for the whole system and a particular dislike for some of its exemplars. The natural outcome was the attempt undertaken in the autumn to objectify this antagonism in *The Borderers*. It is worthy of note that the name Mortimer, which was given in 1796 to the character afterwards called Marmaduke in the printed version, was one which Wordsworth himself

<sup>19</sup> *Letters*, I, 108.

used as a pseudonym at the time.<sup>20</sup> Wordsworth, like Mortimer, had been a dupe of Godwinism, but had learned his lesson.

J. R. MACGILLIVRAY

University College, Toronto

---

ANOTHER SOURCE OF THE "LONESOME ROAD"  
STANZA IN *THE ANCIENT MARINER*

Perhaps another element that mingled in the "magic brew" of Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, 446-451, in addition to *Inferno*, XXI, 25-30 and *Faerie Queene*, III, vii, 2; v, iii, 18; vi, xi, 27, mentioned by Professor Lowes in *The Road to Xanadu*, ed. 1930, p. 528, is Blair's *Grave*, 55-70. It is at least as close to Coleridge's stanza as is the passage described by H. O. White (*London Times Literary Supplement*, no. 125, p. 28, Jan. 14, 1926). This passage is quoted below with the passage from Blair to show the similarity of the two, which may have been more than accidental, since *The Grave* appeared in 1743, four years before the poem "on the Battle of Culloden addressed to the Duke of Cumberland by G. Masters 1747."

(1) *The Grave*, 56-70.

Oft in the lone church-yard at night I've seen,  
By glimpse of moonshine chequering through the trees,  
The schoolboy, with his satchel in his hand,  
Whistling aloud to bear his courage up . . .  
Sudden he starts, and hears, or thinks he hears,  
The sound of something purring at his heels;  
Full fast he flies, and dares not look behind him,  
Till out of breath he overtakes his fellows;  
Who gather round, and wonder at the tale  
Of horrid apparition, tall and ghastly,  
That walks at dead of night, or takes his stand  
O'er some new-opened grave . . .

(2) On the Battle of Culloden.

As when a swain belated on his way  
Sees as he fancies through the close of day

---

<sup>20</sup> In publishing *The Convict* in the *Morning Post* on December 14, 1797. See note in *T. L. S.*, Dec. 25, 1930.

A ghostly spectre—struck with pale affright  
 He measures back the ground in hasty flight,  
 Whilst his own shadow by reflection clear  
 Of silver Luna seen, augments his fear.  
 At every breeze, each rustling of the wind,  
 Startled he stops, yet dreads to look behind;  
 Still he believes the phantom at his heels,  
 And his cold touch imaginary feels.

(3) *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, 446-451.

Like one that on a lonesome road  
 Doth walk in fear and dread,  
 And having once turned round, walks on,  
 And turns no more his head;  
 Because he knows a frightful fiend  
 Doth close behind him tread.

That Coleridge would be more likely to know so popular a poem as *The Grave* than the forgotten poem of Masters is obvious; that he was acquainted with *The Grave* is evident from *Osorio*, IV, i, 47 (with which compare *The Grave*, 18.)

EDWARD G. AINSWORTH, JR.

*University of Missouri*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*The Drama of the Medieval Church*. By KARL YOUNG. Two volumes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. xxii + 1319. \$17.50.

Here at last is the work by Karl Young that those interested in the drama of the medieval church have long desired and eagerly awaited, a monumental work that will replace many previous studies and that is destined itself to become a classic. The author indeed offers such brimming measure—no less than a *corpus* of all the extant liturgical plays together with pertinent comment covering the entire subject—that a reviewer can do little more than drink the contents and offer public thanks for them.

Texts that have appeared in widely scattered publications, as well as others that now appear for the first time, are here assembled, edited from the original manuscripts, arranged in logical sequence and interpreted. Significant facts regarding their provenience, date, connections with the liturgy and *mise-en-scène* are added, and,



whenever occasion warrants, their literary qualities are appraised. Volume I, after a preliminary explanation of the Roman liturgical system, is devoted to the plays and ceremonies associated with the Easter season; volume II is concerned with the Christmas plays and the plays based upon other subjects drawn from the Bible or from church legend. Included are not only the simpler forms of the liturgical drama but the more elaborate productions of the Benediktbeuern and Fleury MSS, the plays of Hilarius, the Beauvais *Daniel*, all the Latin St. Nicholas plays, the *Sponsus* and the *Antichristus*.

It is accordingly from the vantage point of one able to survey the whole terrain that Y. directs his flash-light into dark corners and into corners no longer dark only because he has himself illuminated them in the past. Even when nothing startlingly new is revealed in the present survey, the results are nevertheless valuable because of the authority of the explorer and because we need to know whether his wider researches have substantiated or disproved the theories of pioneers who depended perforce upon partial and often inaccurate evidence. Thus it is important to learn that Y. agrees with Blume in regarding some French monastic community, rather than St. Gall, as in all probability the home of the sequence (I, 184), that he accepts Lange's three-stage development of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* (I, 239), that he considers Meyer's theory concerning the origin of the *Zehnsilberspiel* "an unproved possibility" (I, 678), that he holds Sepet's brilliant inferences regarding the Prophet's Play as in part substantiated (II, 171). It is equally valuable to have Y's judgment upon the work of those who, like Dürre, have based their studies upon his own earlier monographs, or who, like Böhme, have worked over the same field independently.<sup>1</sup>

So conservatively, wisely and urbanely are Y.'s opinions formulated that almost all of them will command the reader's instant and ready acquiescence. In the case of only a few minor details have any questions arisen in my mind. For example, I am not certain that Y. has successfully controverted the arguments<sup>2</sup> for connecting the two Benediktbeuern Passion plays with the Resurrection play in the same MS (I, 537 ff.), and I still believe the evi-

<sup>1</sup> Owing no doubt to the length of time demanded for putting so vast a work through the press, the results of a few recent studies have not been equated with his own; one would have liked Y.'s estimate of O. Schüttelpelz's "Der Wettlauf der Apostel" (Breslau, 1930), G. Cohen's "Comédie latine en France au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle" (Paris, 1931) and H. Spanke's "St. Martial-Studien" (ZfSL., 1931, 282, 385).

<sup>2</sup> They include the rubric "ita inchoatur ludus de Resurrectione," and not only the appearance of the Mercator's wife among the *personae* of the Passion play where she has no rôle (and where Y. assumes her to have been "a silent ornament"), but her absence from the list of characters at the beginning of the Resurrection play where she actually plays a part.

dence convincing<sup>3</sup> for regarding the Passion play itself as, in origin, an extension backward of the Resurrection play rather than an independent growth. Again, is it certain that the *mercatores* of the *Sponsus* owe nothing to their *confrère*, the *unguentarius* of the Easter play, because "borrowing from the Easter plays is rendered improbable by considerations of chronology" (II, 366, n. 4)? Even if we must now date the Vish MS, which contains our earliest example of the *unguentarius*, in the twelfth century (see I, 678; Y. formerly dated this MS in the eleventh century), that MS and the MS of the *Sponsus* would be roughly contemporaneous, and the strong likelihood exists that the former rests upon earlier French traditions.<sup>4</sup> Finally, the editing of the Old French passages in the Origny-Sainte-Benoîte play hardly seems to me to conform to the high standard set by the editing of the rest of the *corpus*: it seems unfortunate at the present time to omit necessary accents, apostrophes and cedillas, and confuse the reader with forms like *cauoit* (*g'avoit*), *seure* (*sevré*), *lares* (*l'arés*), etc.<sup>5</sup>

However, cavilling in connection with a work of this sort is churlish. It is more to the point to stress the fact that not only much information but many stimulating suggestions are to be found on every page of it. Of special interest to students of the vernacular drama will be Y.'s observations about the origins of the miracle play, about the possibilities for comedy in the liturgical drama, and about the derivation of the word *mystère* (II, 409-10, 501). All readers will rejoice in the author's graceful and unpedantic style and in his fresh and sensitive literary evaluations. A special word should be said about the success with which the difficult problems involved in the technical presentation of this vast and unwieldy material have been solved: a good index, carefully selected illustrations and, above all, copious cross references enable one to follow by-paths as readily as journey along the high-road, and make using the volumes a pleasure. Students the world over are indebted to Professor Young for a work that definitely ranks as one of the outstanding achievements of the scholarship of our time.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

<sup>3</sup> This evidence includes the Benediktbeuern and Sulmona plays, the nature of Good Friday and of the services on that day, the records of Passion plays at Easter, and the analogies in the development of other liturgical plays, e. g. the *Peregrini*.

<sup>4</sup> A slip is probably responsible for the confusion regarding the date of the MS of the Beauvais *Daniel*. It is ascribed to the years 1227-34, but twice referred to as of the twelfth century (II, 290, 486).

<sup>5</sup> I should also change some of the punctuation in this text and read *en vois* for *enuois* in the Daniel play (II, 293, II. 127, 133, 139).

*Kommentar zum Beowulf.* Von JOHANNES HOOPS. Heidelberg: Winter, 1932. Pp. x + 334. M. 8.

A *Kommentar zum Beowulf* from the hand of so eminent an Anglicist as Professor Hoops is a significant addition to the materials of Beowulfian scholarship. It is especially valuable now, when each succeeding month sees the printing of new comment on the poem, and each year brings forth revised editions. Mr. Hoops has tried to sort out this mass of recent opinion, to see it in perspective, and to give judgment upon it. The resulting volume will be useful both to Beowulfian specialists and to others who may wish to study the poem seriously.

The form and content of the book follow the title. Except for the concise summaries that introduce each episode and the genealogical tables at the end of the volume, the whole is commentary. Mr. Hoops goes through the poem verse by verse, explaining whatever is not self-evidently clear. The notes range in importance and extent from a brief entry like *worn fela* 'sehr viel' (v. 530) to a four-page treatment of the literary and historical background of the Thryth-episode. Where there is difference of opinion, particularly among modern authorities, the author sets down the chief theories with the names of the sponsors, and then makes his own choice. Now and again, finding himself unable to afford the space for a full record of conjectures (e. g., on the etymology of the name of Grendel, v. 102, or the mythological implications of the Grendel-fight, *ibid.*), he simply refers to the bibliographies in the editions. Frequently, also, he presents only a summary discussion of a difficult passage, directing the reader to his recent *Beowulfstudien* (*Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft 74, 1932) for fuller details; altogether there are more than ninety references to the *Beowulfstudien*, which evidently must be used to supplement the *Kommentar* if one is fully to understand Mr. Hoops' position on disputed matters. Another feature of the commentary is the originality of many of the author's interpretations. In vv. 272-73, for example, he makes *gif it is, swā wē sōþlice secgan hýrðon* parenthetical, and thus gives sense to a passage which has been misunderstood or left unexplained by all editors except possibly Klaeber. And he translates *Næs hē goldhwæte gearwor hæfde āgendes ēst ær gescēawod* (vv. 3074-75) as 'Nicht hatte er das goldreiche Erbe des Eigentümers vorher genauer geschaut,' an interpretation which, though still not identifying *hē*, is a definite advance in clearing up a truly desperate pair of verses. The commentary closes with four pages of 'Nachträge' on articles published too late for consideration in the body of the work.

Such a book is easier to describe than to criticize. With thousands of comments to choose from, the reviewer would be bold in-

deed who sought to base his judgment on a half-dozen of them. Yet the fundamental good sense of Mr. Hoops' exposition may be remarked upon. He steers a middle course between novelty and dogma, veering, when he veers at all, towards conservatism. This conservative tendency is clearest in his textual notes, where conservatism is most desirable. He tenaciously holds to the reading of the manuscript as long as there is any likelihood that it will yield a satisfactory meaning; and where he allows emendation, he requires that it be kept within reasonable limits. Often he defends the manuscript even against Chambers and Klaeber, the most conservative among modern editors. An example is his retention of several genitive plurals in *-e* (*fyrene* 879, *nænigre* 949, *sorge* 2004, *yrmdē* 2005, *sigehwile* 2710); he agrees with Malone (*Anglia*, LIV, 97-98; 1930) that these are early instances of the ultimate levelling of final vowels under *-e-*. Only once does he propose violence to the manuscript, when at v. 3005, unable by other means to cut the knot of *scildingas*, he matches the boldness of Klaeber's *Sæ-Gēatas* by offering the reading *scildwigan*. This is the most acceptable emendation yet proposed, since it involves so little change in the reading of the manuscript; nevertheless the puzzle may still be solved by other means. Mr. Hoops is friendly to interpretation based on the manuscript in passages where emendation has generally been deemed necessary. He accepts Kock's (originally Wyatt's) punctuation and translation of vv. 1013-17, and thus saves *þāra*; he rehabilitates *dōð* at v. 1231 with Malone's discovery of the irony in Wealhtheow's speech; and he makes excellent sense of the manuscript reading of vv. 1931-32 by building upon the old notion of Grein and Ettmüller that *Mōðprȳð* (or *Mōðprȳðo*) is the name of Offa's queen. Not every one will subscribe to Mr. Hoops' judgment in these and other single instances; yet most will agree that his general policy of intelligent caution will profit Beowulfian criticism.

A similar volume should appear every decade, and Mr. Hoops should be the editor.

PUTNAM FENNELL JONES

*University of Pittsburgh*

---

*Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes.* Von MARGARETE WILLINSKY. Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, Heft XXII. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1932. Pp. 227.

For more than a century and a half, Percy's methods in dealing with the *Reliques* have enlisted criticism. Ritson wrote with the

fury of a man demented; Miss Willinsky writes calmly, all passion spent, not to denounce but to explain the berated bishop. The purpose of her book is to review in detail those pieces in the first edition of the *Reliques* which were dependent upon the *Folio Manuscript*. She uses Hales and Furnivall's edition of the *Manuscript* and Schröer's edition of the *Reliques*. Inasmuch as the German scholar's work, reproducing the first edition, provides a synoptic view of the changes made in the second, third, and fourth editions of the *Reliques*, it might be wished that Miss Willinsky had attempted a generalization as to the nature of those changes. Hales and Furnivall found forty-five numbers in the *Reliques* indebted to the *Manuscript*; Miss Willinsky adds one, "The Distracted Puritan." For some reason she has omitted the usual detailed analysis of one of her listed items, "Lady Bothwell's Lament."

Hitherto the available means of scrutinizing Percy's practice have been to make a collation of the several editions of the *Reliques* with the *Manuscript*, to study the sparse annotations in Hales and Furnivall's volumes, to examine the conspectus of Schröer, or to employ Wheatley's printing of the fourth edition of the *Reliques* with its appended texts from the *Manuscript* "in those cases which had undergone considerable alterations." Miss Willinsky's book will spare the student much pedestrian labor. The author also makes a helpful grouping of the pieces according to the widely varying degree of their dependence upon the *Manuscript*. On the basis of an introductory survey of Percy's literary and aesthetic environment, she calls attention throughout the volume, as the poems pass in review, to the meaning of the emendations, in the light of the spirit of the age and of Percy's prepossessions. The effect of the book is to deepen the prevailing impression that Percy was a victim of conflicting tendencies in his period, that he was by intention a poet as well as an editor. His emended or rewritten texts, thus analysed, illustrate Carl Spitteler's dictum that "the popular ballad depends upon emotion, the literary ballad upon thought." In taking thought, Percy made some sacrifice of emotion.

S. B. HUSTVEDT

*University of California at Los Angeles*

*The Bondman: An Antient Storie.* By PHILIP MASSINGER. Edited from the First Quarto with Introduction and Notes by BENJAMIN TOWNLEY SPENCER. Princeton: Princeton University Press for the University of Cincinnati, 1932. Pp. viii + 266. \$3.00.

*The Country Wife.* By WILLIAM WYCHERLEY. Edited with a Critical Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. By URSULA TODD-NAYLOR. Northampton (Mass.), 1931. Pp. lx + 108. \$2.25. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, XII, 1, 2, 3.)

Mr. Spencer has supplied an admirable discussion of the sources of *The Bondman*, of Massinger's fondness for Stoic philosophy, and of the characters of the play. The stage history fails to include Walker's benefit of June 6, 1720 (Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage*, III, 11) and makes no attempt to reconcile the two dates—June 9 and 12, 1719—given by Nicoll (*A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 366) and the single date—June 8—in Genest (II, 644) with Genest's statement for October 29, 1719: "acted but twice since the reign of King Charles the 1st" (III, 2). The anonymous acting version of 1719 receives insufficient attention. In the first place, it was not printed from "an uncorrected first quarto" (p. 3), but from a copy of Q<sub>2</sub>. In only a few cases does 1719 agree with Q<sub>1</sub> as against Q<sub>2</sub> (e. g., I, iii, 181, 188, 212—this last may be a deliberate modernization); in dozens of other cases 1719 perpetuates the errors of Q<sub>2</sub>, even to the omission of whole lines, cf. I, iii, 342, 374; II, i, 158; II, ii, 120; III, iii, 170. Mr. Spencer employs these very references to prove that Coxeter used both quartos in preparing his edition of 1759 but is blind to the fact that at the same time he is determining the source of 1719. Furthermore, Coxeter, and after him Mason and Gifford, owe to the author of the 1719 version many of their emendations (as I, i, 13; ii, 28, 38; iii, 121, 329; II, iii, 25; v, i, 63, 68; v, ii, 66) and stage directions (as at I, ii, 19, 28, 31, 32; iii, 34). But the note on II, i, 153 is Mr. Spencer's first reference to the use of 1719 by the early editors of Massinger, and nowhere, I believe, does he tabulate 1719 as the first source of variants found in Coxeter and others. Incidentally, the note on "cry ayme" (I, iii, 339) should be modified to record that though Mason printed "ay me" he expressed a preference for the reading of Q<sub>1</sub> and cited parallel passages.

Bibliographical problems and the preparation of the text received special care; so it is surprising that Mr. Spencer overlooked the fact that John Raworth used on sig. A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup> of Q<sub>2</sub> the same headpiece that Edward Allde used on sig. A<sub>3</sub> of Q<sub>1</sub>. He overlooked, too,

what may be more important, namely, the information given by the running titles. Once a compositor had spaced and set up running titles, he seems to have been careful to leave them set up instead of piecing them with the rest of the type after the printing of each form; the saving of time and effort is obvious. Thus in the case of B<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup>, the running title is "*The Bondman*"; for B<sub>2</sub>, B<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup>, and B<sub>4</sub> it is "*The Bond-Man*"; and so for the inner form of each gathering of the quarto. But an accident of some sort befell the outer form. Typical of signatures B to H inclusive, B<sub>1</sub> has the title "*The Bond-man*" and B<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup>, B<sub>3</sub>, and B<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup> have "*The Bond-Man*"; from signature I through L, however, all the pages of this form agree on "*The Bond-man*." Such variations give clues to changes in compositors, to the number of compositors and presses used, or to interruptions in the process of printing a book.

Collation of portions of the text with the McKee copy of Q<sub>1</sub> and the Sewall copy of Q<sub>2</sub> in the Folger Shakespeare Library (to which Mr. Spencer did not have access), and the copy of Q<sub>2</sub> in the Library of Congress (which he used), and the checking of certain readings in the Pierpont Morgan Library copy of Q<sub>1</sub> (which he used) and the Boston Public Library copy of Q<sub>1</sub> (of whose existence he does not seem to be aware) reveal a rather serious number of errors and omissions. Mr. Spencer prints, sig. [A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup>], "NAMES" for "NAMES."; I, i, 9, "*Carthage*." for "*Carthage*."; I, ii, 12, "obserued" for "obserud"; I, iii, 137, "Freedome" for "freedom"; I, iii, 158, "obey all" for "obey in all"; I, iii, 159, s. d., "*State*" for "*State*."; I, iii, 296, "Justice" for "Iustice" (he retains the "I" in I, iii, 150; III, iii, 63, and elsewhere); II, i, 45, "well" for "will"; III, iii, 89, "seceure" for "secure"; III, iii, 139, s. d., "*Olimpia*" for "*Olympia*"; III, iii, 144, "Within." for "Within"; IV, i, 10, "care" for "care."; IV, i, 19, "pure" for "pure."; V, i, 130, s. d., "*Leost. &*" for "*Leost. and*"; and V, ii, 33, "redeeme" for "redeeme". He fails to note many significant readings of Q<sub>2</sub>, such as, sig. A<sub>3</sub>, line 4, "make a tender" for "make tender" of Q<sub>1</sub>; I, i, 10, "their" for "those"; I, iii, 126, "an" for "and"; I, iii, 206, "nor" for "noe"; I, iii, 210, "Nor" for "No"; II, i, 178, "feare" for "feares"; II, ii, 39, speech tag, "*Grac.*" for "*Asot.*" (is this error original with Q<sub>2</sub>, or is it derived from some such copy of Q<sub>1</sub> as that in the Huntington Library?); II, ii, 44, "squeasie" for "queasie"; II, ii, 84, "often" for "oft"; II, iii, 55, "were" for "weare"; II, iii, 84, "suffring" for "suffrings"; IV, iii, 115, "stand" for "am"; IV, iii, 151, "yet priz'd" for "yet he priz'd"; Q<sub>2</sub> omits "*Exeunt*" at the end of I, i, and numbers I, iii, as I, ii, but these errors are not listed, nor are the following in Q<sub>1</sub>: I, iii, s. d., "*Archidamus*" for "*Archidamus*"; I, iii, 81, s. d., "*Cleon*," for "*Cleon*."; IV, ii, 50, "*Archid.*" for "*Archid.*"; IV, iii, 38, "*rhe*" for "*the*." The silent correction of

turned letters and other typographical peculiarities is to be condemned in an edition of this sort because of the assistance they give in checking the stages of printing. And the retention of lower case letters at the beginning of lines (see I, iii, 155; IV, iii, 102; IV, iv, 42; V, i, 40, V, iii, 34) and of such obvious errors as "i'le" (I, iii, 218) is a questionable practice especially when the second quarto gives the correct reading; it would be better to follow the later quarto and list the errors among the variants. Several times Mr. Spencer remarks that modern practice calls for different punctuation from that found in *Q*<sub>1</sub> and in his notes even suggests improvements, failing entirely to record that *Q*<sub>2</sub> often supplies the desired reading (see the notes on II, ii, 73; V, ii, 91; V, iii, 50).

The edition of *The Country Wife* exists primarily for Miss Todd-Naylor's thoughtful introductory essay. She deals competently, though briefly, with "The Morality of the Restoration Stage," "The Relation between Town and Country," "The Place of *The Country Wife* in Restoration Comedy," and "The Relative Importance of French and English Influence in the Development of Restoration Comedy." Despite Miss Todd-Naylor's objection, there is much to be said for Brome as a direct ancestor of Restoration Comedy. I notice several errors, but will cite only two: "1721" (p. ix) is a misprint for either "1671" or "1672"; "Cozens" (I, i, 386) almost certainly does not mean "simply to cheat" but rather "male acquaintances."

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

*The Johns Hopkins University*

*The Comedy of Manners from Sheridan to Maugham.* By NEWELL W. SAWYER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931. Pp. vi + 275. \$3.00.

*American Adaptations of French Plays on the New York and Philadelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War.* By RALPH HARTMAN WARE. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930. Pp. 138.

*Robert Jephson (1736-1803): A Study of His Life and Works.* By MARTIN SEVERIN PETERSON. (University of Nebraska studies in Language, Literature, and Criticism, No. 11.) Lincoln, Nebraska, 1930.

"Sinning has ceased to be a fine art." This penetrating phrase, like many more in Professor Sawyer's study, takes us to the heart



of the matter. This lost art is regrettably wanting to anyone who like Professor Sawyer seeks to recapture in the drama of the last century the insouciance that distinguished the Restoration gentry who lived, wrote, and viewed the genuine comedy of manners.

We cannot object to his able clarification of this type as an art form. It is a champagne of rare vintage, full flavored only in Etherege, Congreve, and Sheridan. Its detachment and its austere rejection of sentimentality and moral pose make it especially appealing to the present-day critic. Professor Sawyer's definition recalls the equally exacting one of naturalistic drama drawn up by Maxim Gorky, and it might also be supplemented by that writer's confession: "Now, as a matter of fact, I know no play written according to this theory in all European literature, and for myself, I could never write one." It might even be doubted that those Restoration dramatists, who, Professor Sawyer believes, "for all times achieved the comedy of high life," were deeply aware of their ideal, or that they reflected a society so close to intellectual and moral emancipation as is commonly assumed.

To seek such rarified ingredients in the nineteenth or even the twentieth century theatre of England is to look for the proverbial needle. The writer is aware of the difficulty. The tendency of the times, he declares, was towards the self recognition in the theatre of middle class democracy. "In a veritable comedy of manners the public would have found escape rather than recognition in a world of unnatural wit and sparkle." For this "intellectual excursion" the Victorians had no desire. Boucicault, whose experiments deserve more notice than is here given them, wrote as one making a decisive discovery in the success of his *The Prima Donna* (1852): "The question, then, is settled, and the London public will accept this class of drama [the French brand of the sentimental]." When in 1868 he tried to provide the Bancrofts with a manners play, *How She Loved Him*, he commented upon its failure: "The public pretend they want pure comedy; this is not so. What they want is domestic drama, treated with broad comic character. A sentimental, pathetic play, comically rendered, such as *Ours*, *The Colleen Bawn*, *Arrah-na-Pogue*."

In his critical analysis of a large number of plays, the writer has shown himself sympathetic and just in his approach. I was especially pleased to note his appreciation of the neglected efforts of Douglas Jerrold and Westland Marston to give the values of the manners type to their theatre. His study of W. S. Gilbert is especially helpful as is also his fresh approach to the work of Pinero, Jones, and Wilde. He brings vividly to mind many half forgotten successes that deserve better of our memory. Such, for instances, are Godfrey's *The Parvenu*, "among the pleasantest and truest pictures of genuine English social life of its decade," H. H. Davies'

*The Mollusc*, and R. C. Carton's *Lord and Lady Algy*, for which last he serves also as publisher, because it is not in print.

Not in Shaw nor in Barrie, nor in any supreme writer of our times, is to be found the creator of immaculate comedy. It is Maugham who for us has "achieved the full-fledged comedy of manners." Something is wanting to all others except, perhaps, Oscar Wilde. "The comedy of manners—does not flourish in English soil," is the author's conclusion, but he believes it will "persist as the expression of a small, select, unrepresentative group in society." His work is a modest and convincing tribute to the persistent vitality of the genre, which has outlived, if but weakly, a social avalanche.

Mr. Ware, supplementing Professor Schoenberger's researches, completes the account of American translations of French plays to the middle of the century, providing notes on divergences and summaries of the plots. A brief historical note gives the salient aspects of the practice and calls attention to Boucicault's effectiveness as chief huckster of the stolen goods. Half of the study is devoted to this adapter, affording matter of real value for the biographer of this neglected genius. Dr. Ware proves him to have been adroit in utilizing his originals and in most respects to have been above the level of play translators. This opinion is made convincing by careful comparisons that for the first time fully reveal Boucicault's methods. The account of the transference of French realism to the American stage, notably in the numerous adaptations of *La Dame aux Camélias* remodeled to comply with prevailing theatrical decorum, yields much fresh matter concerning the battle with Mrs. Grundy. In all respects the study is thorough, accurate, and of lasting value.

Robert Jephson, in Mr. Peterson's not too carefully printed monograph, appears as a curious symbol of his theatre world rather than as a dramatist of intrinsic merit. His faulty plays neither survived nor deserved to survive their first popularity. Two, however, appear in Dicks' *The British Drama* (1865). He does, as the writer carefully shows, represent amusingly the confused standards of tragic excellence in the Garrick period in that his plays blend the "terrific" with the classic under a heavy Shakespearean veneer. His dramaturgy was clumsy, if not absurd, even when it occasionally afforded a theatrically telling scene, like Velasquez's seizure of Braganza's duchess. Mr. Peterson does not minimize these defects. He does, however, seem to concur in the high opinion of Jephson's contemporaries regarding the merit of his verse, which, we are told, rises "frequently to an inspired level." I should prefer the adverb *infrequently* and substitute *hypnotic* for *inspired*.

*Philosophie der Literaturwissenschaft.* Herausgegeben von EMIL ERMATINGER. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1930. x + 478 pp. Mk. 26.

Über dieses gewichtige, seiner inneren Ausdehnung nach weit über die Kompetenz des einzelnen Fachmanns hinausgehende Werk kann der Besprecher kaum mehr als berichten, zumal auf knappem gebotem Raume. Unter Ermatingers Führung vereinigen sich hier dreizehn Gelehrte, um von den verschiedensten Seiten her die literaturwissenschaftliche Methodenlehre, ihre Abgrenzung und weltanschauliche Fundierung historisch und systematisch zu untersuchen.

Im einleitenden Aufsatz, *Die Entwicklung der Literaturwissenschaft von Herder bis Wilhelm Scherer*, zieht Franz Schultz die Linien, die von den Anfängen der Wissenschaft bis zu ihrer Neuorientierung in unsern Tagen führen, indem er zugleich die Fäden zu sondern und zu bezeichnen sich müht, die zuletzt wieder aufgenommen und zu neuer Webe verwoben werden. — Nach einem kurzen kritischen Überblick über die Geschichte und Wandlung des Begriffes Volkstum stimmt Hermann Gumbel (*Dichtung und Volkstum*) der Spamerschen Formulierung zu; daß es "eine Geistesart, eine bestimmte Weise des Fühlens und Denkens, Empfangens und Gestaltens" sei, "die jene bevorzugte geistige Gemeinsamkeit mit den Volksgenossen gibt, welche das Volkstum ausmacht". Hervorgegangen aus bestimmten, äußeren, natürlichen Faktoren, gemeinsamen Kulturinhalten, gemeinsamen geschichtlichen Erlebnissen und Bedingungen, ist es nicht starre, feste Form sondern werdendes Wesen, geschichtlich erkennbar und daher in späteren Stadien der Entwicklung besser zu fassen als in frühen. Dichtung ihrerseits ist Niederschlag der besonderen Reaktionsweise in Sprache und Schrift, und es kann entweder die Frage aufgeworfen werden, wie sie vom Volkstum bedingt ist oder inwiefern sie auf das Volkstum wirkt. Trotz seiner (oder wegen seiner) äußerst kritischen Haltung sollte dieser Aufsatz mit seiner Fülle von Direktiven eine Fundgrube für Doktoranden sein.

Mit bekanntem sprühendem Konzeptismus, oft erhellend, manchmal verwirrend, mustert Cysarz (*Das Periodenprinzip in der Literaturwissenschaft*) die verschiedenen Periodisierungssysteme und kommt zu diesem Schlusse, daß das Heil der literarischen Periodenbildung nicht in der Abgrenzung von homogenen Zeiträumen, sondern "in Auswahl und Verwebung echter Periodizitätselemente liege, die der äußersten Fülle des Individuellen als solchen die äußerste Fülle der (nicht verarmenden sonder bereichernden) Bezüge gesellt". Dem Nacheinander der Ablaufstrecke der Historie gegenüber stehe der einheitliche Kreislauf der literarhistorischen Periode, eine Sphäre eigener Evidenz. Periodologie ist folglich "realhistorische Sinnfindung", die eine bewußte

Emanzipation der Literaturwissenschaft von der sinnlosen Welt-historie verlange; denn Historie habe es mit Vergangenen, Literatur mit dem Werdend-seienden zu tun (Aristophanes steht uns nicht ferner als George Bernard Shaw!). Kritische Periodologie ist daher Aufhebung von Oberflächenantithese von Individualismus und Kollektivismus, Auswahl, Proportionierung des Wesentlichen.

Im Prinzip kommt Petersen zu ungefähr denselben Schlüssen in bezug auf das Problem *der literarischen Generationen*. Auf festem Boden der Literaturgeschichte fußend, mit reichem und die ganze deutsche Literaturentwicklung umfassendem Tatsachenmaterial weist er die Anwendung formalistischer und biologischer Generationstheorien zurück zu Gunsten einer solchen, die zugleich den physischen, psychischen und soziologischen Faktoren Rechnung trägt. Die Generation bedeutet nicht einfach eine Spanne von  $33\frac{1}{3}$  Jahren, sie ist nicht errechenbar. Vererbung und Geburt sind Zufallsfaktoren. Freilich fördert Gleichaltrigkeit die zusammenschließende Reaktion gegen eine erstarrte ältere Generation. Gleiches Zeiterleben und Schicksalsgemeinschaft (der aber auch Ungleichaltrige sich anschließen können) führt zu Gruppenbildung, die durch gleiche Führerideale und Generationssprache gefestigt wird. Zu dieser Zeiteinheit bringt Stamm- und Landschaftssystem ein räumliches Korrelat. Der Anlagetypus des Einzelnen bedingt die Ausbildung führender, gleichgeschalteter und unterdrückter Individualitäten, von denen die letzteren oft eine Generationsspaltung verursachen. In der Produktion sind (nach Pinder) Einheit der Darstellungsmittel und Einheit der Probleme zu scheiden. So stellt sich das Generationsgebilde als "ein Einssein durch Schicksalsgemeinschaft" dar, "die eine Gleichheit der Erfahrungen und Ziele in sich schließt."

Ausgehend von der Doppelfunktion der Kunst, zeitlos als Schein die Wirklichkeit zu negieren — im Zeitfluß zu offenbaren, was eine Kulturgemeinschaft von der Wirklichkeit zu erleben vermocht hat, unternimmt es Fritz Medicus, im Gegensatz zu Croces Lehre von der Einheit der Künste, ihre Verschiedenheit, ihre Polarität zu erweisen.

Bildende Künste mit ihrer Beziehung auf äußeres Sein im Raume stellen Träger der erlebten Problematik dar, erlauben nur indirekten Ausdruck des Ausdrucks. Redende Künste und Musik mit Beziehung auf Dynamik in der Zeit stellen die Auflösung des Seienden in Bewegung, die Problematik selbst dar, sind direkter Ausdruck. Während dort Gegensätze im Nebeneinander den Raum erfüllen, können hier Gegensätze im Hintereinander nicht substantiell die Zeit erfüllen. Während in der Dichtung verschiedene Zeitordnungen nebeneinander bestehen können, ist in der bildenden Kunst ein solches Verhältnis der Räume nicht möglich.

Nach kritischer Betrachtung der Verwirrung der Kunstgrenzen durch ausübende Künstler wendet sich Medicus zu Wölfflins Kate-

gorien und betont auch hier die Gegensätzlichkeit der Bedeutung von offener und geschlossener Form in Raumkünsten und Zeitkünsten. In der bildenden Kunst sei geschlossene Form Ausdruck der Geschlossenheit des Seins, Seinsform; in der redenden Kunst Zeugnis des Glaubens an eine Vollendung des Menschen im Überzeitlichen. Offene Form in der bildenden Kunst bedeute Spannung der menschlichen Dinge auf das Mehr-als-Menschliche; in der Dichtung Darstellungsform der Problematik des Lebens. (Während Medicus hier die Anwendung der Wölfflinschen Kategorien durch neue Ausblicke erweitert, scheint dem Besprecher weder seine Deutung noch Periodisierung einleuchtend. Die Gegensätzlichkeit, die er in Anwendung der Kategorien auf bildende und redende Kunst und Musik sehen will, ergibt sich durch Beziehung derselben auf Gehalt statt auf Gestalt. Sobald man die Termini "harmonisches" und "antithetisches" Lebensgefühl einsetzt, ist der Widerstreit behoben.) Ähnlich wie Pinder betont Medicus endlich das Vorherrschen *einer* Kunst als höchste Ausdrucksmöglichkeit für bestimmte Perioden.'

Robert Petsch fällt die undankbare Aufgabe zu, über *die Analyse des dichterischen Kunstwerkes* zu sprechen, die trotz Heranziehung zahlreicher Beispiele denn auch etwas abstrakt und farblos ausfällt. *Das Dichterporträt in der Literaturgeschichte* von Walther Muschg unterscheidet etwas willkürlich zwischen schöpferischem (Goethe, Tieck etc.), naivem (Gervinus, Schererschule), oppositionellem (H. Grimm, Gundolf) Individualismus und philosophischer Literaturwissenschaft (Hegelianer, Dilthey) und ruft Heil jenem Jüngling, der einmal die Gotthelfbiographie schreiben wird. Der Mystik des C. G. Jungschen Aufsatzes *Psychologie und Dichtung* wird nur der folgen können, dem seine früheren Schriften nicht unbekannt sind. Seine Ausführungen machen die übrigen Aufsätze dieses Buches einigermaßen illusorisch, denn wenn die Betonung des Irrationalen in Dichtung und Literaturwissenschaft auf die Spitze des "kollektiven Unbewußten" getrieben wird, so kann von eigentlichen Methoden der Forschung, um die hier gerungen wird, kaum noch die Rede sein. Wenn nicht Goethe den *Faust* macht, sondern *Faust* den Goethe, so müssen wir doch fragen, warum "dieses Bild, dem Unbewußten seit Urzeiten eingegraben", das "schläft, bis die Ungunst der Zeit es weckt, nämlich dann, wenn ein großer Irrtum das Volk vom richtigen Wege lenkt", warum dieses Bild nicht auch Klinger, oder den Maler Müller oder etwa Schiller gemacht habe. Auf Hitler ließe sich eine solche primitive Anschauung eher anwenden.

Ob man die von Ermatinger im ersten Teile seines Aufsatzes (*Das Gesetz in der Literaturwissenschaft*) mit bestrickender Logik entwickelten Gesetze als solche oder auch nur als Postulate auffaßt, die Methodologie wird durch sie bedeutend gefördert, geklärt und gefestigt. Die Anwendung dieser vier Gesetzbegriffe: Sinnein-

heit, Typus-Individuum (oder Gattungs- und Einzelwesen), Polarität, Stetigkeit auf die drei Problemkreise: Gemeinschaft als volklicher und zeitlicher Lebensraum, Persönlichkeit des Dichters, dichterisches Werk, illustriert an praktischen Beispielen, zeigt, wieviel durch diesen reifen, besonnenen und in seiner knappen, abgeklärten Formung wundervollen Aufsatz gewonnen ist.

Die Anregungen, die Nadler in bezug auf *das Problem der Stilgeschichte* gibt, beziehen sich hauptsächlich auf die Abhängigkeit des Dichters von zeitgenössischer Poetik, Publikum, Censur, soziologischen Umständen. Im übrigen aber ist sein Aufsatz so apodiktisch und wortkarg, daß man den Eindruck hat, er gehe aus Ressentiment und verborgenen Antagonismen hervor.

Ermateringer glücklich ergänzend legt Max Wundt für den Gegenstand wie für die Methode der literaturwissenschaftlichen Untersuchung fünf Weltanschauungstypen fest, von denen die vier ersten polar sind, die fünfte Synthese. Aus Hinwendung zur äußeren und inneren Erfahrung ergeben sich Naturalismus und Psychologismus, aus Hinwendung zur Idee subjektiver und objektiver Idealismus (abstrakt-ästhetisch: konkret-ideengeschichtlich). Der konkreten Wirklichkeit wie der allgemeingültigen Idee wird nur der absolute Idealismus gerecht. Diese Typen sind schon in Goethes Terminologie Nachahmung der Natur (1), Manier (2) und Stil (3-5) gekennzeichnet.

Klärend für die Begriffe *Weltliteratur* und *vergleichende Literaturgeschichte* wirkt der Aufsatz von Fritz Strich, der für Weltliteratur eine überräumliche und überzeitliche Auswahl in Anspruch nimmt, die Fragen aufwirft, wann und warum tritt eine Nationalliteratur in die Weltliteratur ein, und die Ziele in Selbsterkenntnis in bezug auf die nationale Eigenart, in Duldung und Verständnis (in bezug auf die internationale Gemeinschaft) findet. Der deutschen Literatur ist Weltgeltung dadurch erschwert, daß ihr Beitrag die Idee vom Wert der Individualität, der formschöpferischen Kraft ist; der französischen dagegen mit ihrer Betonung des europäischen Zivilisationsgeistes auf Grund menschlicher Vernunft ist sie erleichtert. — Sarnetzki endlich verlangt Gerechtigkeit für die Kritik des Tages und eine regere Beteiligung der Literaturwissenschaft in den literarischen Gegenwartsproblemen.

Wenn in diesem zeitentsprechenden, großangelegten Werke bei der Verschiedenheit der Standpunkte seiner Autoren Widersprüche und Wiederholungen (so trotz geschichtlicher Würdigung ein unverhältnismäßiges Abstrafen Scherers und seiner Schule) unvermeidlich sind, ist indessen eine stark einheitliche Grundrichtung nicht zu verkennen. Daß sich hier Vertreter aller zeitgenössischen Richtungen mit gegenseitiger Rücksicht und Achtung unter einer Decke vereinigen, ist höchst erfreulich. Die Förderung, die der

Wissenschaft durch dieses Werk zugute kommen wird, kann nicht hoch genug veranschlagt werden. Es wird auch späteren Generationen noch ein Meilenstein bedeuten.

ERNST FEISE

---

*The Life of Robert Burns.* By FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932. Pp. xiii + 524. \$4.00.

Scottish biography is burdened with more than its share of controversy. Queen Mary, Burns, Carlyle, to name only three of the outstanding figures on the national roll—not only have they all attracted an exceptional amount of biographical attention, but the writing has often been acrimonious and partisan. Of late years there are signs that Stevenson, too, is to become a storm center. It does not seem that this can be laid to the argumentative tendencies of their countrymen, for the combatants are often Englishmen. It must rather be that the lives and characters of these people have in them something peculiarly provocative, something which draws interest and leads men to take sides.

In the case of Burns especially, the element of patriotism has tended to increase the violence of the discussion. Burns's services in providing in his songs a not too articulate race with an outlet for their emotions have made of him a national idol. Gratitude and pride of race have combined to produce an unwillingness to face the facts of a far from immaculate career, and this in turn has invited the apostles of candor to expose these facts with a somewhat distorted emphasis. The biographer of Burns today enters the field with his life in his hands.

Professor Snyder, it may be said at once, has carried through his task without succumbing to its characteristic dangers. His book is based on exhaustive scholarship; it is well documented, well arranged, well written; and the final estimate of the man and his work is eminently balanced and sane. With this book, Professor Ferguson's edition of the letters, and a complete text of the poems, the future student of Burns is completely equipped.

Owing to the recklessness or worse of some of the earlier biographers, a considerable mass of legend has gathered round the poet, and there is a great temptation to waste time and paper on it. Professor Snyder has been courageous enough to treat most of this in summary fashion, indicating in few words its origin and lack of foundation, and so dismissing it. The reader will pay tribute to the sense of fairness and good judgment which this book conveys by finding himself disposed to take the author's word for it that there need no more be said. For this relief, much thanks.

Perhaps the most important contribution made to our knowledge of Burns's life in the present volume is in the treatment of his

last years and of the cause of his death. Dr. Snyder had already discussed this matter in special articles; now when his new facts take their place in the total picture he convinces us that Burns's last years were not those of a drunken wastrel, that he retained to the last a virile independence and self respect, and that he died, not from alcoholism as Currie, a fanatical teetotaler, had implied, but from a rheumatic endocarditis, the seeds of which were sown by over exertion before he had well emerged from boyhood. The importance of this is not confined to the refutation of a cruel slander, for the diagnosis explains much of the nervous moodiness and dejection from which the poet often suffered throughout his life.

The impression of Burns's personality gained from Dr. Snyder's presentation differs curiously from that left by the reading of the Letters. Burns was proud of his epistolary style, and many of his letters were conscious exercises in fine writing. In spite of occasional simple and spontaneous utterances, the main bulk of Professor Ferguson's volumes is in a prose which exhibits some of the worst characteristics of eighteenth-century style—labored, pretentious, and self-conscious. Further, a great many of the letters remind us unpleasantly that they were written to people whom Burns regarded, in spite of his theoretical equalitarianism, as his social superiors. The result is that we carry away too strong a feeling of a kind of snobbishness. The *Life* corrects this. Brought face to face with his daily activities, his loves and hates, his strength and weakness, the reader realizes that these relations with great folk were but a fraction of his life and interests, and that the man was substantially frank and honest and stood on his own feet.

Though the book is primarily a biography rather than a critical study of the poems, it closes with an admirable summing up of "Burns the Poet," which brings out in clear relief the qualities in his work which have made him the great figure he is.

I think that Professor Snyder has accomplished his purpose and has produced what is likely to be for a long time to come the standard life of Burns.

W. A. NELSON

*Smith College*

---

*The Life and Writings of Hugh Henry Brackenridge.* By CLAUDE MILTON NEWLIN. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1932. Pp. viii + 328. \$5.00.

Appreciative sketches have long been available but this is the first full-length portrait of Brackenridge who, according to as competent a judge as Henry Adams, was "perhaps the first, and not



far from being the best, of American humorists." The neglect is more curious because Brackenridge possessed qualities that tempt a biographer and because he participated in historic events. After leaving Princeton, where he associated with Madison and Freneau, he taught for several years, served as a chaplain in Washington's army, tried journalism, and finally turned to the law and politics in the frontier village of Pittsburgh to which he migrated in 1781. For him the frontier was a means of escaping from the able competition he would have been compelled to meet in the older section. His political career was soon launched but by supporting the new federal constitution and other measures unpopular with his frontier constituents he aroused sufficient hostility to keep him from elective offices. Nevertheless he remained prominent in the community and was, in fact, a leader in the whiskey rebellion, the most exciting affair of his time and section. His leadership in it was involuntary, for he was caught at the head of the procession and could not escape as he frantically wished to do. This unpleasant experience and repeated political rebuffs did not destroy his sturdy faith in democracy or cause him to abandon his activity on behalf of the Republican party. In 1799 he was rewarded with an appointment as a justice of the supreme court of Pennsylvania, a position he held until his death in 1816.

Nothing in Brackenridge's political career would make him remembered. Had he confined his literary efforts to poetry the result would have been the same. The chief service his Hudibrastic verse performs is to prove again how poor the better American writing of the period was. But, fortunately, he also wrote *Modern Chivalry*, a humorous satire modelled after *Don Quixote* and the first back-country book. In it are recounted the adventures of a captain of militia, who speaks for Brackenridge, and of his ignorant Irish servant through whom the stupidities and pretensions of the frontier are ridiculed. Thus the Irish Sancho Panza is preferred by the people to his intelligent master as the proper person to represent them. In fact nearly all of Brackenridge's experiences were reenacted in *Modern Chivalry*, which was expanded from time to time. The liveliness of the satire is no doubt due to the compensation it afforded Brackenridge for his timidity in action. The wit, the vigorous English, and the accuracy with which the frontier scene is reproduced combine to secure a permanent place for the book.

In making this picture it is evident that Dr. Newlin conceived his function to be that of a photographer rather than that of an artist. The facts have been assiduously gathered from widely scattered sources and are clearly presented, but he is usually content to let them speak for themselves. The desire to present all the facts probably accounts for the large number of quotations from

his verse which might well have been left in the oblivion mercifully supplied by Time. These regrets should not obscure the fact that this is a competent, scholarly treatment of a much neglected subject.

W. STULL HOLT

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*The American Notebooks of Nathaniel Hawthorne.* Edited by RANDALL STEWART. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932. Pp. xcvi + 350. \$5.00.

It is not often that the appearance of a scholarly work has, prior to its review in a place like this, been called to the attention not only of scholars but of the general public by headlines in the daily press. But this excellent edition of Hawthorne's *American Notebooks* by Professor Stewart has had such genuine "news value" that part of the reviewer's task has already been performed. Everyone is by this time informed of the scandalous treatment given her husband's notebooks by Mrs. Hawthorne. The newspaper reporters have broadcast Professor Stewart's disclosures regarding Mrs. Hawthorne's editorial liberties,—how she corrected his grammar and tried to improve his diction; how she polished off his crude native phrases, and prudishly suppressed whatever offended her sense of decency or refinement; how she eliminated personal comments; and worst of all, how she seriously distorted the record of her husband's own temperament and character by her omissions and changes.

All of this disclosure has been incidental to Professor Stewart's preparation of the first authentic text of the *Notebooks* given to the world. Lest anyone who reads these words conclude that Professor Stewart's sole or chief aim has been to bring charges against Hawthorne's wife, let me say that all of the matter that has provided sensational interest for the daily press is confined to eight pages of the book. The reporters read the first chapter of the introduction and stopped!

This contribution to American literary scholarship would be of very high value, if Professor Stewart had done nothing more than provide an accurate text of the *Notebooks*; but all future students of Hawthorne will be even more deeply in his debt, for the service of the editor has not stopped with a scholarly text, but has included two other things for which even higher praise is due. First: he has made a thorough study of the process by which descriptions of real places and people and of actual events in Hawthorne's life passed through the *Notebooks* into the novels and short stories. Some few instances of this transfer have of course been previously known, but the present study is a most thorough pursuit of the

subject. And in the second place Professor Stewart has provided an extremely instructive and helpful (and at times entertaining) annotation, not only of his own able introduction but of the entire text of the Notebooks. Cross-references to Emerson's *Journals*, quotations from Hawthorne's letters, published and unpublished, the identification of individuals not generally known,—all add to the value of this study.

In connection with this annotation I have to express a slight feeling of annoyance at having been obliged to turn pages back and forth unnecessarily one thousand, one hundred and forty times. This inconvenience is caused by the fact that the notes are not given as footnotes but are concentrated in two sections of the book. This policy may have been determined by some economy-officer of the Yale Press and not by Professor Stewart; and the book is such a beautiful piece of work that one hesitates to find fault with anything about it; yet I cannot help wishing that the 461 notes concentrated in pages xc-xcvi had been spread as footnotes through the introduction, and that the 679 notes contained in pages 283-337 had been spread through the text of the Notebooks where they would be immediately accessible.

Two sentences in the editor's preface invite the reviewer to express a hope. Dr. Stewart remarks: "I have found the published versions of Hawthorne's letters in many books to be inaccurate and wholly unreliable. I have also been able to quote from the manuscripts of a large number of letters which are unpublished, either wholly or in part." The notes provided by Dr. Stewart are evidence of his extensive and detailed knowledge of Hawthorne's correspondence, and invite the hope that we may some day soon have the pleasure and profit of seeing Hawthorne's Letters presented with the same scholarly care that the American Notebooks have received.

CARL J. WEBER

Colby College

---

*The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough.* Edited with an introductory study by HOWARD FOSTER LOWRY. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. xii + 192. \$2.50.

The collection by Professor Lowry exceeds in importance anything hitherto published of Arnold's correspondence: for it is addressed to the friend to whom the reserved poet most opened his heart, and belongs chiefly to the formative years before his marriage, years about which we have known least. The earliest of the fifty-six letters to Clough is of 1845, when Arnold was twenty-two

and just out of Oxford; the latest is of 1862, the year of Clough's death. Unfortunately only one of Clough's responses has been preserved.

These letters are not in themselves literature, like those of Arnold's contemporaries Carlyle and Meredith. They are to the highest degree informal, and in the coterie speech of a Rugby-Oxford clique, as the manner of Clough's letter makes doubly clear. Furthermore the intimacy of the correspondents permitted a short-hand of allusion and incompleting expression, which at times defies even Mr. Lowry's editorial pertinacity. In addition to the background supplied by the fifty-three pages of excellent biographical and critical introduction, and the very full and accurate notes, the reader will prosper in proportion to his knowledge of the works of Arnold and Clough and of the social history of Victorian England. For the chief theme of the correspondence is the art of poetry and its relation to the social situation of the mid-century.

Arnold is striving to form a style and a philosophy of life, between which his temperamental need of unity demands a logical connection: "Style is the saying in the best way *what you have to say*. The *what you have to say* depends upon your age. . . . More and more I feel that the difference between a mature and a youthful stage of the world compels the poetry of the former to use great plainness of speech as compared with that of the latter. . . . Modern poetry can only subsist by its *contents*: by becoming a complete *magister vitae* as the poetry of the ancients did: by including, as theirs did, religion with poetry, instead of existing as poetry only." Hence the motivation of what otherwise might seem his unpardonable harshness towards Keats and Tennyson for following the "false track" of Elizabethan ornateness, and towards Browning's "confused multitudinousness." Arnold set himself a gigantic task: "The poet's matter being *the hitherto experience of the world, and his own*, increases with every century. . . . You may often hear my sinews cracking under the effort to unite matter." Judging his own work by such a standard, he is to be excused for his bluntness regarding Clough's manuscripts, and his insistence that his friend not lose himself in philosophical and moral puzzlement when his duty was to cut through to a consistent view and a course of action. The friendship came to a difficult moment in 1851, when Arnold felt it necessary for his intellectual hygiene to shut himself from the atmosphere of contemporary literary opinion, especially from the enthusiastic admirers of Clough's *Bothie*. A break was avoided by absolute frankness on both sides; but thereafter Arnold did not have the same need of Clough, for his style and philosophy were formed, and marriage had supplied a closer confidant. "I am past thirty, and three parts iced over," he wrote in 1853: the intimidating Arnold the world knew had put on full panoply.

The correspondence invites many speculations, some of which may be mentioned briefly. Little light is shed upon the identity of Marguerite, but there is ample evidence of Arnold's rebellious youth, employing a racy and boisterous vocabulary. One advances perceptibly toward solution of the problems of his abandonment of poetry and of the failure of Clough's promise. Everywhere is Arnold's determination to face facts. "I am more and more convinced that the world tends to be more comfortable for the mass, and more uncomfortable for those of any natural gift or distinction—and it is well perhaps that it should be so—for hitherto the gifted have astonished and delighted the world, but not trained or inspired or in any real way changed it." One marvels at the paradox of the supercilious man of the world, the poet in the grand style for the cultivated few, who had the abnegation to write thus at thirty.

EMERY NEFF

Columbia University

---

*The Paradiso of Dante Alighieri.* With a translation into English triple rhyme and a brief introduction by GEOFFREY L. BICKERSTETH. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. xxxiii + 299. \$3.75.

Mr. Bickersteth's volume prints on opposite pages the Italian text of the *Paradiso* and his terza rima translation of it. In his Introduction, in which he discusses with acuteness and sound judgment the problem of translating the *Commedia*, he declares the necessity for more carefully imitating the original in certain vital matters than has been the custom of most translators, especially in the exact movement of Dante's rhythmical periods and in his practice of making the rhyme fall on important words. These are indeed matters deserving attention; but the emphasis with which they are stressed is perhaps inadvisable. For at every turn a translator is confronted by a number of conflicting considerations, by a number of effects which all clamor for reproduction yet cannot all be reproduced; and if he has a fixed rule in favor of some of them instead of determining in each passage those of paramount importance there, his translation is likely to suffer.

But whether too uncompromising in theory or not, Mr. Bickersteth has produced an admirable translation. One naturally compares it with the two best previous renderings of the *Paradiso*; it is clearly superior, as a whole, to Mr. Anderson's in terza rima and to Mr. Fletcher's in modified tercets. In passages of especial beauty, Mr. Anderson's lines are usually more poetic; Mr. Bickersteth does not come even near Mr. Anderson's occasional inspired work (e. g. most of xxxi), and Mr. Grandgent's fine fragment of

the close of the poem is also rather beyond him; but of all English versions of this cantica, Mr. Bickersteth's has the highest and most consistently maintained average of excellence.

Ignoring the contrary mass-verdict of six centuries of readers, Mr. Bickersteth categorically states as a fact, and not merely as his dissenting opinion, that the *Paradiso* is the greatest of the three divisions of the *Commedia*; he denies that its didactic passages are poetically a defect, and says that "every problem— theological, metaphysical, moral, or scientific—raised by Dante is as much a living problem at the present time as it was in his own day," though one gets no further than the second canto before encountering a naïve discussion of the cause of the spots on the moon! Mr. Bickersteth is evidently a Dante cultist, yet we are thereby the gainers in that his unmeasured admiration of the *Paradiso* led him to select it for translation; it has been put into English less often than the other parts of the *Divine Comedy*, and hence this excellent version is especially welcome.

LACY LOCKERT

Nashville, Tennessee

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*The Memoirs of Sir Robert Sibbald*. Edited, with an introduction and a refutation of the charge against Sir Robert Sibbald of forging Ben Jonson's *Conversations*. By F. P. HETT. [New York and] London: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. vi + 107. \$3.00. When Boswell described Sibbald's *Memoirs* as "calmly" entertaining, he was not underestimating its appeal. For a gentleman who knew many of the leading figures of his day (including friends of John Dryden), Sibbald contrived to be vexingly uninformative. But perhaps the very plainness and simple honesty which show through the narrative are the author's best vindication from the charge of forgery. With Mr. Hett's work we may consider the accusations against Sibbald as definitely disposed of—though some doubts concerning the reliability of the *Conversations* still remain. Simpson had already demolished the accusations in his admirable article, "The Genuineness of the Drummond 'Conversations'"; but the picture of Sibbald as it emerges from the *Memoirs* would aid in settling the controversy if further evidence were demanded.

The work of editing is carefully done, and the book is very attractively printed. We wonder, however, whether it was advisable to devote thirty-two pages of a slender volume to the Refutation, to matters most of which had been effectively and concisely treated in Mr. Simpson's essay. To have covered the argument by summarizing this essay would have made for brevity; it would also have

cleared up certain minor points which Mr. Hett leaves unexplained, such as the reason why a few items in the *Conversations* appear elsewhere in Drummond's writings. It would seem that the purpose of the work could have been achieved in a smaller and less expensive volume. Parts of the *Memoirs* are not without general interest. Occurring in the same year as Dryden's, Sibbald's conversion to Catholicism, so clearly sincere and uninspired by mercenary motives, may help us to understand the naturalness and honesty of Dryden's change in religion.

EDWARD NILES HOOKER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Francis Lenton, Queen's Poet.* By LEOTA SNIDER WILLIS. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931. Pp. 98. This study of a seventeenth-century minor poet—and, according to Oldys, "a wretched one God wot"—falls into the common error of overvaluing its subject. When Mrs. Willis remarks (p. 57), "Lenton's *Characterismi*, although a prose composition, ironically enough is the poet's best work," she is making a saner approach than in her passing consideration (p. 40) of the extent to which *The Young Gallants Whirligig* reaches the "lyric cry."

The dissertation includes an account of Lenton's life and times, a discussion of his works, with a bibliography, and a modernized reprint of *Characterismi*. Partly because there are so few records of Lenton's life, the biographical essay depends for many details upon a too literal reading of *The Young Gallants Whirligig* as autobiography. Mrs. Willis ignores the discrepancy, pointed out in the *DNB.*, between the record of Lenton's death, May, 12, 1642, and his commendatory verses in *Lucasta*, 1649. Her style is marred by such sentences as "Lenten's is [*sic*] the experiences in the same life of the gallant above" (p. 24). Judicious annotation of some interesting allusions in the reprint of *Characterismi* would be a welcome substitute for the summaries of textbook material included in the essay without discrimination (*e. g.*, pp. 14 ff., 37-38, 51). Phrases like "A painted Icsabell" (p. 78) and "*Fortuna sauwet Patuous*" (p. 82) call for correction and a footnote, particularly in a modernized reprint.

The least excusable fault of this dissertation is its general carelessness in method. A check with the Huntington copies shows that the bibliography, which could be recorded scientifically in the space devoted to it, is not consistent even in the style adopted. There are four errors (one the omission of an entire line) in a single quotation from the *Innes of Court Anagrammatist* (p. 43), and throughout the dissertation misprints are all too numerous.

ERNEST A. STRATHMANN

*Pomona College*

*A Poetical Rhapsody, 1602-1621.* Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. xii + 331. \$4.00. This volume, which contains a textual and critical introduction and notes, completes Professor Rollins's edition of Davison's important anthology. Since it joins a long row of definitive editions on Mr. Rollins's five-foot shelf, there is no need of saying that it displays, like its predecessors, incomparable learning, industry, and accuracy. One can only hope that Mr. Rollins will remain a sufficiently happy and energetic warrior to re-edit, with the same final authority, a great deal more Elizabethan poetry which we still must read by the dubious light of such worthies as Grosart. The chief problem in *A Poetical Rhapsody* concerns the eighty-one poems credited, in Davison's manuscript lists, to "A. W." While earlier editors and some recent scholars have taken "A. W." to be the initials of some individual poet, Mr. Rollins makes out a full and plausible argument for the suggestion offered by W. J. Linton in 1882, that the initials stand for "Anonymous Writer" or "Anonymous Writers." At any rate those who think otherwise may exclaim (with Denham's Trojans): "Darkness our Guide, Despair our Leader was."

DOUGLAS BUSH

*University of Minnesota*


---

*A Shakespeare Handbook.* By RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN. Revised and enlarged by OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL. New York: Crofts, 1932. Pp. xvi + 302. \$1.50. *Le secret de Shakespeare, Les Sonnets.* By EDMOND L'HOMMEDÉ. Paris: Henri Didier, 1932. 230 pp. Fr. 15. In this new edition of the late Professor Alden's handbook, besides some revision and rearrangement, there are additional chapters on "England in Shakespeare's Day," "Shakespeare's Dramatic Career," "Elizabethan Theatres," "Elizabethan Dramatic Companies," and "Shakespeare's Text." Though they are sometimes shaky in their dates (editions of Hakluyt in 1582 and 1587 and of *Polyolbion* in 1617 come as news), and some obvious misprints in the earlier edition still stand ("But here me this," p. 100; "Nor near no farther off," p. 101), in this ampler form the book should better serve the purpose for which it is intended.

M. L'Hommedé's book contains a new reading of the riddle of Shakespeare's sonnets, a rendering of them in French, apparently original, and a reordering of the series according to the author's divinations. Here Essex is the fair friend and Marlowe the rival poet; Shakespeare's fault is a liaison with Lady Rich, which, revealed to Essex by Greene's jealousy, brings about the estrangement of patron and poet. For this hypothesis the author offers no



corroborative evidence whatsoever; he has simply evolved it, in D. H. Lawrence's phrase, from the bowels of his own comprehension and presents it with an ingenuousness that utterly disarms criticism.

M. A. SHABER

*University of Pennsylvania*

---

*Literary Friendships in the Age of Wordsworth.* Selected and edited by R. C. BALD. New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. xxiv + 284. \$1.75. (The Cambridge Anthologies.) It was an excellent idea to gather into a pleasant, handy volume what the principal writers of the early nineteenth century said about one another. Some of these descriptions and comments are none too well known, some almost everyone has forgotten, and the greater part the average reader has not read and does not know where to find. The book makes interesting reading and will be useful for college courses. Nearly all the selections are prose, and wisely so; as it is, some of the verse, Coleridge's *Dejection*, his lines to Wordsworth on hearing *The Prelude*, and the stanzas from the *Adonais*, might well have given place to extracts from the minor writers of the period—even Trelawney's vivid and illuminating descriptions are omitted.

R. D. H.

---

*George Moore: "A Disciple of Walter Pater."* A University of Pennsylvania Thesis in English. By ROBERT PORTER SECHLER. Philadelphia: 1931. Pp. 158. This work, with all the marks of haste upon it, leaves a great deal to be desired equally in content and in form. The author segregates elements in the writings of Moore similar to certain features in Pater, and concludes that they are derived from Pater's influence. Needless to say, Moore's mind was not so simple as this implies; the genesis of his ideas was far more complex. A wider acquaintance with the period and a more candid reading of Moore would have prevented many of the deficiencies apparent in this study, which deprive it of any considerable value.

EDWARD NILES HOOKER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Harrington and the Jews.* By S. B. LILJEGREN. Bulletin de la Société royale des Lettres de Lund 1931-1932. iv. 28 pp. This brief study points out some political implications of the ingenuous proposal of the author of *Oceana* to settle a colony of Jews in Ire-

land and the evidence it affords of the growth of the idea of toleration in his time. It also discusses the influence of Jewish oral traditions on English political thought during the Commonwealth, though to Harrington and most of his contemporaries, Milton included, these traditions were known only remotely and imperfectly.

M. A. SHAABER

University of Pennsylvania

---

*Fifth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, by J. E. WELLS. New Haven: 1932. Pp. 1337-1432. \$1.50. The present supplement brings the *Manual* up to July, 1932. It follows, of course, the scheme familiar to users of the *Manual* itself and the four previous supplements, and it goes without saying that the standard of accuracy and thoroughness set by the author's earlier work is here maintained. Wells's *Manual* is one of the chief ornaments of American anglistic scholarship, and it is good to know that so fundamental a bibliographical work is so regularly brought up to date. The author is to be congratulated once again on his fine achievement.

K. M.

---

*The Pearl*, edited by Members of the Chaucer Course in Bowdoin College. Boston: 1932. Pp. x + 84. \$1.50. This edition, prepared by Professor Stanley P. Chase and eight of his students, is designed to meet the needs of would-be readers and students of the poem who are not, and perhaps do not intend to become, specialists in Middle English, but who nevertheless wish to learn to know the work as the poet wrote it, not in a Modern-English translation. The editors have made a good job of it. The Bowdoin edition of the *Pearl* does with success what it was meant to do, and ought to make better known to the laity one of the masterpieces of 14th century English literature.

K. M.

---

*The Pearl*, rendered in Modern Verse with an introductory Essay by STANLEY PERKINS CHASE. New York: 1932. Pp. lxiv + 110. \$2.50. Professor Chase here gives us a judicious summary of critical opinion and a most happy translation. The volume is beautifully printed and attractively bound. Translator, publishers and public alike are to be congratulated on this excellent production.

K. M.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Able, Augustus Henry, 3rd.—George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: A Study in Literary Influence. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933. Pp. 140.

Batho, Edith C.—The Later Wordsworth. *New York*: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. xii + 418. \$6.00.

Chambers, E. K.—Sir Thomas Wyatt and Some Collected Studies. *London*: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1933. Pp. [viii] + 228. 7 s. 6 d.

Craigie, Sir William A.—A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue: From the Twelfth Century to the End of the Seventeenth. *Chicago*: University of Chicago Press, 1933. Pp. 241-360. \$5.00. (Part III, Berk—Broke.)

Croce, Benedetto.—The Defence of Poetry: Variations on the Theme of Shelley. Translated by E. F. Carritt. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. 32. \$0.40. (Philip Maurice Dencke Lecture, Oxford.)

Dottin, Paul.—L'Angleterre: Nation Continentale. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1933. Pp. 318. F. 22.50. (Collection du Temps Present.)

Keller, Wolfgang; Hecht, Hans (eds.).—Shakespeare Jahrbuch. *Leipzig*: Tauchnitz, 1933. Pp. iv + 242. M. 10. (Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, volume LXIX.)

Matheson, Belle Seddon.—The Invented Personages in Shakespeare's Plays. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932. Pp. 84.

McKay, Ruth Capers.—George Gissing and his Critic Frank Swinnerton. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933.

Meeks, Leslie Howard.—Sheridan Knowles and the Theatre of his Time. *Bloomington, Indiana*: Principia Press, 1933. Pp. xii + 240. \$3.25.

University of Michigan English Department.—Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature. *Ann Arbor*: University of Michigan Press, 1933. Pp. [viii] + 278 + x. (Language and Literature, X.)

Norman, F.—Waldere. *London*: Methuen, 1933. Pp. viii + 56. 2 s. (Methuen's Old English Library.)

Partridge, Eric.—Slang To-day and Yesterday: With a short historical Sketch and Vocabularies of English, American and Australian Slang. *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. x + 476. \$5.00.

Rogers, Richard, and Ward, Samuel.—Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, ed. with

(5757 University Avenue): American Society of Church History, 1933. Pp. xiv + 148. \$3.00. (Studies in Church History, II.)

Schneider, Elizabeth.—The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt: A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 200.

Spenser, Edmund.—The Works of, A Variorum Edition. Ed. Edwin Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, F. M. Padelford. The Faerie Queene, Book Two. Eds. E. Greenlaw, R. Heffner, J. G. MacManaway, E. A. Strathmann. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. xii + 518. \$6.00 to subscribers only.

Stephens, George R.—The Knowledge of Greek in England in the Middle Ages. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933. Pp. 168.

## GERMAN

Ahmling, Ludwig.—Liber Devotae Animae. Ein neues Werk Johannes Rothes. Vorstudien zu einer Ausgabe des Gedichts. Diss. *Hamburg*: 1933. 72 pp.

Barthel, Friedrich.—Der vogtländisch-westerzgebirgische Sprachraum [Mitteldeutsche Studien, H. 5 = Teuthonista, Beiheft 7]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. 96 pp., 34 maps. 4°. M. 6.

Baumgart, Hermann.—Goethes lyrische Dichtung in ihrer Entwicklung und Bedeutung. Zweiter Band, hrsg. von Dr. Gertrud Baumgart. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. iv, 378 pp. M. 10.50.

Beer, Karl.—Neue Forschungen über den Schöpfer des Dialogs "Der Ackermann aus Böhmen" [S.-A. aus: Jahrb. d. Ver. f. Gesch. d. Deutschen in Böhmen, Bd. 3]. [*Prag*: Ver. f. Gesch. d. Deutschen in Böhmen, 1932]. 56 pp.

Behm-Cierpka, Stefanie.—Die optimistische Weltanschauung in der deutschen Gedankelyrik der Aufklärungszeit. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 120 pp.

Behrend, Fritz.—Theodor Fontane. Zu seinem Leben und Schaffen (Aldus Druck). *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1933. 73 pp. M. 3.30.

Behrens, Ada.—Der entwurzelte Mensch im Familienroman von 1880 bis zur Gegenwart. Diss. *Bonn*: 1932. 45 pp.

Berg, Kurt N.—Johann Nepomuk Ringseis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Romantik. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1932. 76 pp.

Biltz, Karl Peter.—Das Problem der Ironie in der neueren deutschen Literatur insbesondere bei Thomas Mann. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 84 pp.

Bischof, Berchtold.—Jakob Bidermanns "Joannes Calybita" (1618). Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Diss. Freiburg, Schweiz. *Engelberg*: Stiftsdruckerei, 1932.

Blassneck, Marce.—Frankreich als Vermittler englisch-deutscher Einflüsse im 17. u. 18. Jh. Diss. Teildruck. *Köln*: 1933.

Bodarwé, Emmy.—Der Stil der verdeckten Bedeutung in den Novellen Paul Ernsts. Diss. Bonn. *Würzburg*: Mayr, 1933. viii, 77 pp.

Boller, Hedwig.—Das Erlösungsproblem bei Jeremias Gotthelf. Diss. *Zürich*: 1932. vi, 127 pp.

Brinkmann, Otto.—Das Erzählen in einer Dorfgemeinschaft. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. 72 pp., 1 plate.

Burdach, Konrad.—Platonische, freireligiöse und persönliche Züge im "Ackermann aus Böhmen." [Aus: Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 133, 14]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1933. 68 pp. 4°. M. 4.50.

Cohn, Hilde.—Realismus und Transzendenz in der Romantik, insbesondere bei E. T. A. Hoffmann. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 103 pp.

Damerau, Erika.—Paul Heyeses Dichterbegriff. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1932. 87 pp.

Eberth, Friedrich.—Die Liedweisen der Kolmarer Handschrift und ihre Einordnung und Stellung in der Entwicklungsgeschichte der deutschen Liedweise in 14.-16. Jh. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1933. 114 pp.

Ernst, Franz.—Die Tiere der deutschen Anrufe- und Ansingelieder. Diss. Teildruck. *Hamburg*: 1933. 49 pp.

Frey, Adolf, und Spitteler, Carl.—Briefe. Hrsg. von Lina Frey. *Frauenfeld*: Huber [1933]. 265 pp. M. 6.

Gamper, Esther.—Dichter und Dichtertum zur Zeit des Jungen Deutschland. Diss. *Zürich*: 1932. 135 pp.

Gebhardt, Heinz.—Glasbrenners Berlinisch. Diss. *Greifswald*: 1932. 133 pp.

Gillies, Alexander.—Herder und Ossian. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1933. 189 pp.

Gottschalk, Hilde.—Wesen und Form der Gespräche aus dem Kreis der Blätter für die Kunst. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 136 pp.

Günzburger, Elsbeth.—Stileigenheiten der Romantik. Diss. Teildruck. *Bonn*: 1933. 43 pp.

Hasper, Eberhard.—Leopold von Sacher-Masoch. Diss. *Freiburg i. B.*: 1932. 107 pp.

Irle, Lothar.—Die Vornamengebung im Siegerland. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1932. 54 pp.

John, Ernst.—Das Schachgedicht des Pfarrers zu dem Hechte. Diss. *Königsberg*: 1932. 70 pp.

Kampf, Kurt.—Das Tier in der deutschen Volkssage der Gegenwart. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1932. 111 pp.

Karg, Fritz.—Flämische Sprachspuren in der Halle-Leipziger Bucht. [Mitteldeutsche Studien. H. 6 = Teuthonista. Beiheft 8].

Klare, Hans-Joachim.—Nordgermanischer Totenglaube dargestellt auf Grund der gesamten altnordischen Originalliteratur. 1. Tl. Die Toten. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin*: 1933. 56 pp.

Klemm, Günther.—Christian Morgensterns Dichtungen von "Ich und Du." [Mnemosyne, H. 12]. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. 71 pp. M. 3.

Köster, Alex.—Julian Schmidt als literarischer Kritiker. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Realismus in 19. Jh. und zur Geschichte der Kritik. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. ix, 102 pp.

Koplowitz, Ruth.—Hölderlin als Briefschreiber. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1932. 59 pp.

Kreienbaum, Sophie Marie.—Die Idylledichtung Jean Pauls. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 85 pp.

Lardschneider - Ciampac, Archangelus.—Wörterbuch der Grödnert Mundart [Schlern-Schriften. 23]. *Innsbruck*: Wagner, 1933. xxxi, 480 pp. 4°. M. 20.

Laurenze, Ernst.—Berthold von Holle. Studien zur äusseren und inneren Form seiner Werke. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1932. 123 pp.

Leoni, Editha.—Clemens Brentano und die deutsche Barocklyrik. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1932. 35 pp.

Leyen, Friedr. von der.—Volkstum und Dichtung. Studien zum Ursprung und zum Leben der Dichtung. *Jena*: Diederichs [1933]. 189 pp. M. 6.60.

Mensel, Ernst Heinrich.—Die erste deutsche Romeo-Übersetzung, herausgegeben. [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. XIV, Nos. 3-4]. *Northampton, Mass.*: Smith College, 1933. xxvi, 88 pp.

Meyer, Kurt.—Die Novellen Paul Heyeses und Thomas Manns. Eine vergleichende Stiluntersuchung. Diss. *Leipzig*: Fischer, 1933. iii, 83 pp.

Minnesinger, Die, in Bildern der Manessischen Handschrift. Mit einem Geleitwort von Hans Naumann [Insel-Bücherei. Nr. 450]. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag [1933]. 47 pp. 80 Pf.

Müller, Josef.—Die Mundart von Dietschweiler, ihr Wort- und Lautbestand auf Grundlage des Mittelhochdeutschen. Diss. *München*: 1933. 132 pp.

Naumann, Hans.—Germanische Spruchweisheit [Deutsche Reihe, Bd. 7]. *Jena*: Diederichs [1933]. 65 pp. 80 Pf.

Obenauer, K. J.—Die Problematik des ästhetischen Menschen in der deutschen Literatur. *München*: C. H. Beck, 1933. x, 411 pp. M. 9.50.

Paul, Hermann.—Deutsches Wörterbuch. 4. Aufl. von Karl Euling. Lieferung 2 u. 3.

**Paustian, Helmut.**—Die Lyrik der Aufklärung als Ausdruck der seelischen Entwicklung von 1710-1770 [Literatur und Seele, Bd. 3]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1933. 220 pp. M. 7.

**Pfaff, Wilhelm.**—Zum Kampf um deutsche Ersatzwörter [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 31]. *Giessen*: v. Münchow, 1933. 62 pp. M. 3.

**Rademacher, Helmut A.**—Richard Dehmels Drama und Bühne. Diss. *München*: 1933. 103 pp.

**Röhl, Hans.**—Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. Achte, vollständig durchgearbeitete u. verm. Aufl. *Leipzig*: B. G. Teubner, 1931. viii, 382 pp. M. 4.80.

**Roer, Walther.**—Soziale Bewegung und politische Lyrik im Vormärz 1840-1848. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. 314 pp.

**Roseno, Agnes.**—Die Entwicklung der Brieftheorie von 1655-1709. (Dargestellt an Hand der Briefsteller von Georg Philipp Harsdörfer, Kaspar Stieler, Christian Weise und Benjamin Neukirch). Diss. *Köln*: 1933. 58 pp.

**Rothmund, Walter.**—Wortbiegungslehre (Substantiv, Adjektiv, Pronomen) der Mundart von Eschbach bei Waldshut. Diss. *Freiburg i. B.*: 1933. 45 pp.

**Rudolph, Norbert.**—Das Gedankliche im Drama. Diss. *Bonn*: 1932. 48 pp.

**Rütsch, Julius.**—Das dramatische Ich im deutschen Barock-Theater. Diss. *Zürich*: 1932. iv, 211 pp.

**Sauer, August.**—Gesammelte Schriften Bd. 1: Probleme und Gestalten. Mit einem Vorwort von Hedda Sauer hrsg. von Otto Pouzar. *Stuttgart*: Metzler, 1933. xi, 272 pp. M. 9.50.

**Scheele, Günter.**—Der psychologische Perspektivismus im Roman. Diss. *Berlin-Neukölln*: Rother, 1933. 60 pp.

**Schiprowski, Erwin.**—Der Zauberer Merlin in der deutschen Dichtung. Diss. *Breslau*: Antonius-Verlag, 1933. 134 pp. M. 3.

**Schmidt, Johannes.**—Studien zum Bieldrama der Empfindsamkeit. Diss. *Breslau*. *Brieg*: Berger, 1933. 125 pp.

**Schneider, Hermann.**—Germanische Heldensage. Bd. 2, Abt. 1, Buch 2: Nordgermanische Heldensage. [Grundriss d. germ. Philologie, 10, 2]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1933. 326 pp. M. 9.

**Schönle, Gustav.**—Das Trauerspiel Carolus Stuardus des Andreas Gryphius. Quellen und Gestaltung des Stoffes. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. 56 pp., 1 plate. M. 2.10.

Vergangenheit. Nr. 20]. *Stuttgart*: Kepler-haus [1933]. 32 pp. 25 Pf.

**Simon, Artur.**—Vom Geist und Stil der frühmittelhochdeutschen Dichtung. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 58 pp.

**Sonnenberg, Werner.**—Studien zur Lyrik David Schirmers. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1932. 77 pp.

**Spranger, Eduard.**—Goethes Weltanschauung [Insel-Bücherei. Nr. 446]. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag [1933]. 83 pp. 80 Pf.

**Staiger, Emil.**—Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Diss. Teildruck. *Zürich*: 1933. iv, 67 pp.

**Stein, Siegfried.**—Die Ungläubigen in der mittelhochdeutschen Literatur von 1050 bis 1250. Diss. *Heidelberg*. *Berlin-Wilmersdorf*: Eisner, 1933. 99 pp.

**Stemmlinger, Eduard.**—Der Münchner Kreis. Platen, Curtius, Geibel, Strachwitz. Hrsg. [Deutsche Literatur. Reihe 21. Formkunst. Bd. 1]. *Leipzig*: Reclam, 1933. 342 pp. M. 7.50.

**Tesmer, Hermann.**—Experimentelle euphonische Untersuchung einzelner Vokale und Silben in der deutschen Sprache. Diss. *Halle*: 1933. 132 pp.

**Wahl, Hans.**—Wieland und Napoleon. (Bibliophile Gabe zu Wielands 200. Geburtstag am 5. Sept. 1933) [= Cento-Drucke. 6]. *Weimar*: Duncker, 1933. 45 pp., 3 plates. M. 19.50.

**Weber, Clara.**—Die Heischelieder an Fastnacht im Rheinlande. Diss. *Köln*: 1933. 184 pp., 2 plates.

**Weber, Eberhard.**—Der Erlösungsgedanke im Goetheschen Urfaust. Diss. *Rostock*: 1933. 96 pp.

**Wechsler, Gerhard.**—Johann Christoph Gottscheds Rhetorik. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. xvi, 111 pp.

**Weyden, Mathias Hubert Joseph.**—Eduard von Schenk, ein bayerischer Dichter und Staatsmann. *Graz*: Stiasny, 1932. 254, cxxvii pp., 2 leaves.

**Wolfram von Eschenbach.** Hrsg. von Albert Leitzmann. H. 3: Parzival, Buch 12-16. 2., verb. Aufl. [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek. Nr. 14]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. xiii, 192 pp. M. 3.50.

**Ziemer, Meline.**—Datierung und Lokalisierung nach den Schreibformen von k und z im Althochdeutschen. Diss. *Halle*: 1933. iii, 82 pp., 5 plates.

## FRENCH

**Adolf, Gertrud.**—Die Pensées der Königin Christine von Schweden. Diss. *Heidelberg*:

Bollon, P.—Lexique patois de La Chapelle d'Abondance (Haute-Savoie). *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 101 pp.

Charl  ty, S.—L'Universit   de Paris, du moyen   ge    nos jours. *Paris*: Larousse, 1933. 223 pp. Fr. 30.

Cherel, A.—De T  l  maque    Candide. *Paris*: Gigord, 1933. 526 pp.

Clerc, A.—B.-C. Fagan, auteur comique, 1702-55. *Paris*: Boccard, 1933. 227 pp. Fr. 25.

Cochet, E.—La Patois de Gondecourt (Nord). Gram. et lexique. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 316 pp.

Curtius, E. R.—Balzac, trad. par H. Jourdan, 1933. 440 pp. Fr. 30.

Desonay, F.—Villon. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 200 pp. Fr. 15.

Fondan  , B.—Rimbaud le Voyou. *Paris*: Deno  l et Steele, 1931. 256 pp. Fr. 15.

Fontenelle.—De l'origine des fables,   d. crit. par J.-R. Carr  . *Paris*: Alcan, 1932. 107 pp. Fr. 20.

Fuchs, M.—La Vie th   trale en province au XVIII   s. T. I. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 240 pp. Fr. 40.

Gastard, J.—Chateaubriand, la jeunesse de Ren   en Bretagne. *Paris*: Larcher, 1933. 340 pp. Fr. 18.

Giacomin, V.—Il pensiero filosofico di Cartesio. *Milano*: Ediz. "La prora," 1933. 175 pp. L. 10.

Giraud, V.—La Vie tragique de Lamennais. *Paris*: Alcan, 1933. 188 pp. Fr. 15.

Gregh, F.—L'  uvre de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1933. 536 pp. Fr. 30.

Grosclaude, P.—J.-J. Rousseau    Lyon. *Paris*: Alcan, 1933. 128 pp. Fr. 20.

Gui de Warewic, roman du XIII   s.,   d. A. Ewert. T. I. *Paris*: Champion, 1932. xxxvi + 207 pp. Fr. 16.50. (Classiques fr. du m.   .)

Hugo, V.—Les Ch  timents,   d. crit. par P. Berret. II. *Paris*: Hachette, 1932. 409 pp.

Lach  vre, F.—La premi  re Utopie fr. Le Royaume d'Antangil. *Paris*: La Connaissance, 1933. xxviii + 162 pp.

Leroy, M.—Taine. *Paris*: Rieder, 1933. 224 pp. Fr. 15.

Loukovitch, K.—L'  volution de la trag  die religieuse classique en France. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. xii + 471 pp.

Luc et Bertrand.—La Pens  e fr. et europ  enne des Origines    la Renaissance. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1933. 320 pp. Fr. 20.

Martineau, R.—L  on Bloy et la femme pauvre. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1933. 208 pp. Fr. 12.

M  l  ra, M.-Y.—Rimbaud. *Paris*: Firmin-Didot, 1933. 200 pp. Fr. 5.

M  rim  e, Pr.—Lettres    la Comtesse de Boigne. *Paris*: Plon, 1933. xxii + 303 pp.

—Etudes de litt. russe. *Paris*: Champion, 1933. 607 pp. Fr. 120.

Monaghan, F.—French Travellers in the U. S., 1765-1932. A bibliography. *New York*: Public Library, 1933. xxii + 114 pp. \$1.00.

Muralt, B. L. de.—Lettres sur les Anglois et les Fran  ois et sur les voies (1728),   d. Ch. Gould, Ch. Oldham. *Paris*: Champion, 1933. 384 pp. (Bibl. de la RLC.)

Nasalli Rocca, S.—Giuseppe De Maistre nei suoi scritti. *Torino*: F.lli Bocca, 1933. xvi + 328 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca storica contemporanea, no. 15.)

Orr, John.—French the Third Classic. *London*: Oliver and Boyd, 1933. 31 pp. 1 s.

Pope, F. R.—Nature in the work of Camille Lemonnier. *New York*: Columbia Univ., 1933. xii + 148 pp. (Belgian Series, Inst. of Fr. Studies.)

Racine.—Andromaque,   d. L  on Beck. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1933. 125 pp.

Raymond, M.—De Baudelaire au Surr  alisme. *Paris*: Corr  a, 1933. 420 pp. Fr. 25.

Schilperoort, G.—Le Commer  ant dans la litt. fr. du moyen   ge. *Paris*: Nizet et Bastard, 1933. xi + 158 pp. Fr. 50.

S  n  chal, Ch.—Les Grands courants de la litt. fr. contemp. *Paris*: Malf  re, 1933. 450 pp. Fr. 24.

Thomas, Jean.—L'Humanisme de Diderot. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1932. 185 pp. (Etudes fr.)

Vigny.—  uvres compl  tes. Corresp. (1816-35),   d. F. Baldensperger. *Paris*: Conard, 1933. xviii + 429 pp. Fr. 40.

Zdanowicz, C. D. (ed.)—Four Fr. Comedies of the Eighteenth Century (Turcaret, Jeu de l'amour, Philosophe sans le savoir, Barbier de S  ville). *New York*: Scribner, 1933. xxxiv + 488 pp. \$1.00.

## ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia. Con la vita di Dante di Niccol   Tommaseo, con note del Tommaseo e d'altri illustri commentatori, a cura di E. Fabietti. *Milano-Sesto San Giovanni*: A. Barion, 1933. 653 pp. L. 4.

—La Divina Commedia. Edited and annotated by C. H. Grandgent. Revised edition. *Boston*: D. C. Heath and Co., 1933. xlii + 1003 pp. \$3.60.

Arcoleo, G.—Le opere. II: Uomini e tempi. Con prefazione di G. Paulucci di Calboli Barone e A. Casulli. *Milano-Venona*: A. Mondadori, 1932. xxxi + 292 pp. L. 28.

Barbi, M.—Dante: vita, opere e fortuna. Con due saggi su Francesca e Farinata. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. 270 pp. L. 10.

Bernardino da Siena, Santo.—I sermoni latini: principali festività dell'anno. A cura di D. Pacetti. *Siena*: E. Cantagalli, 1932. xxxiv + 229 pp. L. 16. (I classici cristiani, no. 34-35.)

Bevilacqua, E.—Vincenzo Monti. La vita, l'opera, i tempi. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1928. 243 pp. L. 5.

Boffito, G.—Scrittori barnabiti o della congregazione dei chierici regolari di San Paolo; 1533-1933. Biografia, bibliografia, iconografia. F.M. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. 633 pp.

Bussani, I.—Il romanzo cavalleresco in Luigi Pulci. *Torino*: F.lli Bocca, 1933. vi + 207 pp. L. 12. (Piccola biblioteca di scienze moderne, no. 407.)

Campagnoli, A.—Alessandria intellettuale. *Bologna*: Officine graf. combattenti, 1932. 4to., 319 pp.

Chiappini, F.—Vocabolario romanesco. Edizione postuma della scheda a cura di B. Migliorini. *Roma*: "Leonardo da Vinci," 1933. xxvi + 342 pp. L. 30. (Istituto di studi romani.)

Crescini, V.—Romanica fragmenta. Scritti scelti dall'autore, pubblicati a cura dell'Università di Padova, del reale Istituto veneto, dei colleghi, amici e discepoli. *Torino*: G. Chiantore, 1932. xxvii + 606 pp. L. 100.

Croce, B.—Conversazioni critiche. Serie terza e quarta. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1932. 2 vols., 409, 397 pp. (Scritti di storia letteraria e politica, no. 25-26.)

De Gregori, L.—La stampa a Roma nel secolo XV. Mostra di edizioni romane nella r. Biblioteca Casanatense, aprile-maggio 1933. *Roma*: Tip. Cuggiani, 1933. 29 pp. (Istituto di studi romani.)

De' Medici, Lorenzo.—Poesie. Con saggio introduttivo di Giosuè Carducci. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1932. lxxii + 471 pp. L. 6.

De Rubertis, A.—Ghiberti e la Toscana. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. 270 pp. L. 20. (Studi e documenti di storia del risorgimento, no. 10.)

Di Benedetto, S.—Storia e folklore di Raffadali. *Spoletto*: Tip. dell' Umbria, 1933. 71 pp.

Di Carlo Seregni, Elena.—Un romanziere e biologo inglese, amico dell'Italia: Samuel Butler, 1835-1902. Con prefazione di G. Gallavresi. *Milano*: S. a. ediz. "Athena," 1933. 211 pp. L. 10.

D'Ovidio, F.—Versificazione romanza. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1932. viii + 335 pp. L. 20. (Opere, IX, 3.)

Fogazzaro, Antonio.—Il Santo. *Milano-Vercena*: A. Mondadori, 1931. 470 pp. (Tutte le opere di Antonio Fogazzaro, no. 7.)

Foscolo, Ugo.—Poesie e prose. A cura di G. Rispoli. *San Casciano Pesa*: Soc. edit.

toscana, 1933. xxiv + 450 pp. (Biblioteca classica popolare italiana e straniera.)

—Ultime lettere di Jacopo Ortis. Premesse le considerazioni morali scritte nel 1817 da Giovita Scalvini. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1932. xxx + 154 pp. L. 4.

Garibaldi, Giuseppe.—Le memorie: nella redazione definitiva del 1872, a cura della Reale Commissione. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1932. 670 pp. L. 10. (Edizione nazionale degli scritti, no. 2.)

Gianella, A. M.—Piccola storia delle maschere italiane. Quadri a colori di A. Collino. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 88 pp.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Commedie scelte pubblicate per cura di R. Nocchi. Un curioso accidente; Terenzio; Le baruffe chiozotte; La bottega del caffè; La locandiera; Il burbero benefico; I rusteghi. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. xxxi + 486 pp. L. 7.50.

—Il bugiardo; commedia in tre atti. Introduzione e note di G. Parisi. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1933. 108 pp. L. 4.

Hauvette, H.—La "morte vivante." Etude de littérature comparée. *Paris*: Boivin et Cie., 1933. vi + 216 pp. Fr. 15. (Bibliothèque de la Revue des cours et conférences.)

Knease, T. M.—An Italian Word List from Literary Sources. Compiled by —. *Toronto, Can.*: The University of Toronto Press, 1933. 70 pp. \$1.00.

Li Gotti, E.—G. Berchet. La letteratura e la politica del risorgimento nazionale: 1783-1851. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1933. 564 pp. L. 26. (Storici antichi e moderni.)

Lombardi Satriani, R.—Canti popolari calabresi, a cura di —. *Napoli*: E. De Simone, 1933. xvi + 406 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca delle tradizioni popolari calabresi, IV.)

Lo Parco, F.—Un viaggio attraverso l'Irpinia compiuto da P. P. Parzanese nell'agosto del 1835. Con saggio illustrativo, note storiche, filologiche, artistiche, alla narrazione e ad altri scritti inediti del poeta e ventidue incisioni fuori testo. *Avellino*: Pergola, 1933. 92 pp. L. 12. (Società storica irpina, collana di studi regionali, no. 2.)

Mariotti, M.—Intervista con Torquato Tasso. Saggio su l'Eroico nella "Gerusalemme liberata." *Vercelli*: R. Vercellino, 1929. 240 pp.

Maturi, S.—Bruno e Hegel. A cura di A. Guzzo. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1926. li + 95 pp. L. 8. (Il pensiero moderno, no. 20.)

Mazzini, Giuseppe.—Epistolario. Volume XXXVI. *Imola*: P. Galeati, 1932. vi + 389 pp. (Edizione nazionale degli scritti editi ed inediti di G. Mazzini, LXI.)

—Scritti politici editi ed inediti. Volume XXI. *Imola*: P. Galeati. 1932. liv +

420 pp. (Edizione nazionale degli scritti editi ed inediti di G. Mazzini, LXII.)

Metastasio, Pietro.—Didone abbandonata. Con introduzione e note di G. Raya. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1933. 138 pp. L. 3.50. (I grandi scrittori.)

Montagna, G.—La poesia di Cecco Angiolieri. *Pavia*: Ist. pavese arti graf., 1933. 196 pp. L. 12.

Papini, Giovanni.—Il sacco dell'orco. Prefazione di E. Allodoli. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 281 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca Vallecchi, no. 39.)

Parini, Giuseppe.—Il Giorno, con il dialogo "Della nobiltà" e odi scelte. Commento di G. Dominici. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1933. 300 pp. L. 7. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Pastorello, Ester.—Bibliografia storico-analitica dell'arte della stampa in Venezia. *Venezia*: La r. Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1933. 331 pp. (Miscellanea di studi e memorie, no. 1.)

Pellico, Silvio.—Le mie prigioni. *Milano-Sesto San Giovanni*: A. Barion, 1933. 191 pp. L. 2.

Primicerio, Elena.—Amadigi e la bella Oriana. Racconto cavalleresco. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. ix + 153 pp. L. 9. (Mitì, storie, leggende.)

Ragguaglio, II, dell'attività culturale e letteraria dei cattolici in Italia. 1933, quarto anno. *Milano*: Ediz. "Ragguaglio," 1933. xiii + 290 pp. L. 7.

Rovida, G.—Dal "Novellino" a D'Annunzio. Novelle italiane d'ogni secolo scelte e annotate da —. *Catania*: Casa edit. "Etna," 1933. 139 pp. L. 3.50. ("Saturnia": collana di classici italiani per le scuole, no. 1.)

Savonarola, Girolamo.—Le lettere; ora per la prima volta raccolte e a miglior lezione ridotte da R. Ridolfi. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. 4to., exciii + 272 pp. L. 150.

Schloss, Carlotta.—Dante e il suo secondo amore. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1928. 314 pp. L. 30.

Serafino, Giuseppina Maria.—Le donne dell'Orlando Furioso. *Palermo*: Ediz. "Il popolo di Sicilia," 1933. 107 pp. L. 8.

Tasso, Torquato.—La Gerusalemme liberata. Con prefazione e note di G. Stiavelli. *Milano*: A. Barion, 1933. 543 pp. L. 4.

Vianello, C. A.—La giovinezza di Parini, Verri e Beccaria. Con scritti, documenti e ritratti inediti. *Milano*: Baldini e Castoldi, 1933. 328 pp.

Zambarelli, L.—Il servo di Dio Giulio Salvadori. *Roma*: Cattedra e Bibliot. Franciscana, 1932. 45 pp.

Zecchini, A.—Carducci e D'Annunzio nella mia terra. Prefazione di A. Sorbelli. *Faenza*: F.lli Lega, 1933. xv + 197 pp. L. 16.

## SPANISH

Acevedo, B. y M. Fernández.—Vocabulario del bable de occidente. *Madrid*: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1932. xii + 242 pp. VI láms. 10 ptas. (Archivo de tradiciones populares, III.)

Alcántara, San Pedro de.—Tratado de la oración y la meditación. *Madrid*: G. del Amo, 1933. 380 pp. 3 ptas.

Alfonso, J.—Azorín. *Valencia*: Cuadernos de Cultura, 1933. 46 pp. 0.60 ptas.

Balseiro, J. A.—Novelistas españoles modernos. *New York*: Macmillan, 1933. xxi + 476 pp.

Barja, C.—Libros y autores modernos. Edición revisada y completada. *Los Angeles*: Campbell's Book Store, 1933. viii + 446 pp. \$2.25.

Bean, M. E.—Handbook of Spanish-English and English-Spanish legal words and phrases. *New York*: Appleton, 1933. 257 pp. \$2.50.

Gates, E. J.—The metaphors of Luis de Góngora. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933. 190 pp.

Gutiérrez Gamero, E.—El ocaso de un siglo (Memorias). *Barcelona*: Editorial Juventud, 1932. 5 ptas.

Hemingway, E.—Death in the afternoon. *New York*: Scribner's Sons, 1932. 517 pp. \$3.50.

Jiménez, T. R.—Platero y yo. Nueva edición. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 144 pp. 3.50 ptas.

Juliá Martínez, E.—La amistad entre Quevedo y Adam de la Parra. *Madrid*: (s. i), 1932.

Los poetas vivos de Costa Rica.—Colección de A. J. Echevarría. *San José, C. R.*: Imp. Alsina, 1933.

Lozoya, Marqués de.—El cronista D. Pedro López de Ayala y la historiografía portuguesa. *Madrid*: Tip. de Archivos, 1933.

Reparaz, G. de.—Historia de la colonización. Tomo I. *Barcelona*: Edit. Labor, 1932. 468 pp. 9.50 ptas.

Répide, P. de.—Isabel II, reina de España. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1932. 5 ptas.

Rodríguez, Marín, F.—Coser y cantar. Apuntes para una figura de mujer. *Sevilla*: M. Carmona, 1933. 193 pp. 5 ptas.

— Documentos referentes a Mateo Alemán y a sus deudos más cercanos. *Madrid*: Tip. de Archivos, 1933. 55 pp. 3 ptas.

Romano, J.—Pedro Antonio de Alarcón, el novelista romántico. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 216 pp. 5 ptas.

Willis, R. S. Jr.—The relationship of the Spanish *Libro de Alexandre* to the *Alexandreis* of Gautier Chatillon. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton University Press, 1934. 94 pp.



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIX

MARCH, 1934

Number 3

---

## SPENSER, RONSARD, AND BION

By pointing to intermediate continental sources, recent studies have gone far to counteract the tradition that Spenser resorted directly to classical literature. However, two of his poems, *March* of the *Calender*, and *Astrophel*, are still usually referred to Bion's Fourth and First Idylls respectively.<sup>1</sup> Yet both Spenser's poems, strangely enough, appear to be more closely related to Ronsard's free paraphrases of the two Greek poems: namely, *l'Amour oysseau* (1560) and *Adonis* (1563).<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, there is little or no evidence of Spenser's direct acquaintance with his ultimate classical originals.

E. K. thus introduces his Glosse upon *March*:

This Aeglogue seemeth somewhat to resemble that same of Theocritus [now known as Bion's Fourth], wherein the boy likewise telling the old man, that he had shot at a winged boy in a tree, was by hym warned, to beware of mischiefe to come.

Differences between Bion and Spenser perhaps outnumber similarities. To Herford's analysis of the two poems Hughes<sup>3</sup> adds this variance: that whereas Spenser's more modern Thomalin shoots all his bolts at Cupid, Bion's Ixeutas puts together all his lime-rods, and disgusted at his failure goes to the old man, who warns him against further attempts. This discrepancy suggests to Hughes

<sup>1</sup> For *March* see Herford, ed. *Calender*, 106-107, and Jones, *A Spenser Handbook*, New York, 1930, 54-55; for *Astrophel* see R. Shafer, "Spenser's *Astrophel*," *MLN.*, xxviii (1913), 224-226, and Jones, *ibid.*, 330-331. The important contribution of M. Y. Hughes, "Spenser and the Greek Pastoral Triad," *SP.*, xx (1923), 184-215, will be referred to.

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres Complètes de P. de Ronsard*, ed. P. Laumonier (Paris, 1914-1919), vi, 301-302, and iv, 26-37.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 203.

that Spenser has followed some Renaissance treatment of Bion. One notable treatment<sup>4</sup> he overlooks, *l'Amour oyseau*, by Ronsard, with whose poetry Spenser was well acquainted. Two features of *March* may readily have been derived from this free paraphrase.

The first feature has been alluded to. Like Bion's Ixeutas, Ronsard's unnamed youth is bird-liming with rods, not shooting. The youth discovers,

Sur vn arbre Amour emplumé,  
Qui voloit par le bois ramé  
Sur l'une & sur l'autre verdure.  
L'enfant qui ne cognoissoit pas  
Cét oyseau, fut si plein de ioye  
Que pour prendre vne si grand' proye  
Tendit sur l'arbre tous ses lats.<sup>5</sup>

When Spenser's Thomalin bends his bolts upon the bush, Cupid springs forth, whereupon Thomalin (85 ff.),

levelde againe

And shott at him with might and maine,  
As thicke as it had hayled.  
So long I shott, that al was spent;  
The pumie stones I hastily hent  
And threwe; but nought availed:  
He was so wimble and so wight,  
From bough to bough he lepped light,  
And oft the pumies latched.

Certainly Ronsard has nothing to match the resourcefulness of Spenser's rustic.

The remaining point worthy of mention is more striking. Spenser describes Cupid as (79-80),

a naked swayne

With spotted winges, like Peacocks trayne.

---

<sup>4</sup> There is also a short, literal version of Bion's poem by Baïf, *Amour oyseau*; see *Œuvres en Rime de Ian Antoine de Baïf*, ed. Ch. Marty-Laveaux (Paris, 1887), iv, 281.

<sup>5</sup> *Lats* is explained by the editor, *op. cit.*, VIII, 64, as *lacs* (pièges), or *gins*, *snares*, namely, the *gluaux*, or *lime-rods*, later mentioned. The corresponding Greek as translated by Edmonds, *The Greek Bucolic Poets*, Loeb Cl. Lib., New York, 1912, reads: "Rejoicing that he had found what seemed him so fine a bird, he fits all his lime-rods together." The nature and use of the Greek lime-rod is explained by A. J. Butler, *Sport in Classic Times* (New York, 1930), pp. 184-190.

E. K., ever alert for a classical reminiscence, refers the reader "who list more at large to behold Cupids colours and furniture" to Propertius, Moschus, and Politianus, whose translation of the Greek had been rendered into English by Spenser. As Hughes remarks,<sup>6</sup> the conclusion is that any resemblance of Spenser's poem to Moschus should be referred to the lost translation of Politianus. And Herford observes that "the resemblances to Moschus are not very striking." The description of Cupid in Ronsard may have found its way to Spenser's *March*. The quatrain, included only in the first edition of Ronsard's poem, was omitted in all later ones:<sup>7</sup>

Son plumage luisoit plus beau  
 Que n'est du Paon la queue étrange,  
 Et sa face sembloit vn Ange  
 Qu'on voit portrait en vn tableau.

Moschus describes Cupid as wholly naked and winged like a bird; Ronsard and Spenser introduce the comparison with the peacock.

Perhaps not so freely as *March*, *Astrophel* manifests Spenser's independence in handling his subject. Yet his obvious employment of the Venus-Adonis motive has suggested a comparison of the elegy with Bion's *Lament*;<sup>8</sup> and it is mainly in this regard that *Astrophel* presents more extensive parallels with Ronsard's *Adonis*,<sup>9</sup> which adds to Bion's theme a description of Adonis' hunting, his engagement with the boar, and other details drawn from Ovid.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 193. Later, 203, alluding to Upton's note, he states: "Tasso's version [in the *Aminta*] of the story of Love, the Runaway, is indisputably the basis of the form in which Spenser introduced it into *The Faerie Queene*, Book III, Canto vi."

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, VIII, 64. The poem, later entitled *l'Amour oyseau*, appeared first as *Ode*.

<sup>8</sup> Shafer, *op. cit.*, admits only a general resemblance between the two poems. Every parallel suggested finds place in the French version.

<sup>9</sup> Hughes, *op. cit.*, 207-208, in refuting Kerlin quotes a passage from *Adonis* to illustrate the Renaissance use of the pathetic fallacy. Besides Ronsard's, the best known and most elaborate version of Bion's lament is that by M. de Saint-Gelais, *Élégie ou chanson lamentable de Vénus sur la mort du bel Adonis* (1547), ed. P. Blanchemain, I, 127-132. W. P. Mustard, "Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets," *AJP.*, xxx (1909), 274-275, mentions three adaptations, to be found in Alamanni's Eclogue x, Baif's Eclogue ix, and in the second eclogue of Belleau's *La Bergerie*.

<sup>10</sup> The possible connection between Ronsard's *Adonis* and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* is discussed by Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in*

With the motive of Venus' grief for Adonis—Stella for Astrophel—Spenser adds that of his hunting, thus shadowing Sidney's martial exploits. The story of the Netherlands thus supplements that of the courtly but melancholy shepherd in the *Arcadia*: Astrophel in Spenser's elegy is first Philisides, whose only fault, "he was not so happie as the rest." Naturally, then, Spenser's Astrophel is not far removed from Ronsard's Adonis, "berger & chasseur tout ensemble."<sup>11</sup> Thus perhaps the long passage (49-72) which relates the devotion of Astrophel and Stella vaguely reflects Ronsard's voluptuous account of the felicity of Venus and Adonis.

The first intimation of the Venus-Adonis motif as found in Bion, occurs in the allusions to Astrophel's hunting (79-114), Spenser's "borespear" prompted possibly by Ronsard's "espieu," as "toyles and subtil traines" by "toiles & filets." Spenser's couplet,

What need perill to be sought abroad,  
Since round about us it doth make abroad?

suggests Venus' ample warning to Adonis<sup>12</sup> which after his fatal encounter she sadly remembers,

Las! si tu m'eusses creu, tu n'eusses assailly  
Vn plus fort: au besoin mon conseil t'a failly.

Bion pictures Adonis as he lies bleeding, whereas both Spenser and Ronsard describe the beast's attack; the only comparable lines are these: *Astrophel* (116 ff.):<sup>13</sup>

A cruell beast of most accursed brood  
Upon him turnd . . .  
Launched his thigh with so mischievous might,  
. . . . .  
But on the cold deare earth himselfe did throw.

---

*England* (New York, 1910), p. 221. In Spenser's *Astrophel*, too, Lee finds anticipations of Shakespeare's poem, *Shakespeares Venus and Adonis* (Oxford, 1905), pp. 29-30. The evidence in each case is questionable, as of course all three poems depend in some measure upon Ovid's version of the Adonis legend, *Metamorphoses* 10. 519 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Neither Bion nor Ovid refers to Adonis as a shepherd. That tradition begins with the allusion in Theocritus 1, 109, and it is repeated in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, 18.

<sup>12</sup> Shafer, *op. cit.*, p. 224, compares Bion, 61.

<sup>13</sup> Shafer, *ibid.*, p. 225, cites Bion, 7-10 and 16.

Adonis, after hunting far and wide, discovers a boar and assails it:

le Sanglier estonné  
Se recule à costé, puis de front retourné,  
De trauers luy poussa ses Defenses en l'haine,  
Et tout palle & tout froid l'estendit sur la plaine.

Bion and Ronsard emphasize the grief of Venus. Spenser deliberately subordinates this. Therefore, after describing with relative brevity Stella's expressions of grief, he concludes (169 ff.):

The rest of her impatient regret,  
And piteous mone the which she for him made,  
No toong can tell, . . .

The passage preceding this offers the closest parallels not only to Bion but to Ronsard. *Astrophel* (151-168):

She, when she saw her love in such a plight,<sup>14</sup>  
With crudled blood and filthie gore deformed, . . .  
Her face, the fairest face that eye mote see,  
She likewise did deforme like him to bee.  
  
Her yellow locks, that shone so bright and long,  
As sunny beames in fairest somers day,  
She fiersly tore, and with outrageous wrong  
From her red cheeks the roses rent away,  
And her fair brest, the threasury of joy,  
She spoyld thereof, and filled with annoy.  
  
His palled face, impictured with death,  
She bathed oft with teares and dried oft:  
And with sweet kisses suckt the wasting breath  
Out of his lips like lillies pale and soft:  
And oft she cald to him, who answerd nought,  
But onely by his lookes did tell his thought.

Parallels between Ronsard's free adaptation and Spenser's lines appear in the following passage, the details of which are derived, not from Bion, but from Ovid:<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Shafer, *ibid.*, quotes Lang's translation, 40-42: "When she saw, when she marked the unstaunched wound of Adonis, when she saw the bright red blood about his languid thigh, she cast her arms abroad and moaned, 'Abide with me, Adonis.'"

<sup>15</sup> *Met.* 10. 720-723 (translation of Miller, *Loeb Cl. Lib.*, New York, 1916, II): "And when from the high air she saw him lying lifeless and weltering in his blood, she leaped down, tore both her garments and her hair and beat

Au cry de son ami la pauvre amante vint,  
 Qui plus qu'un marbre froid toute froide deuint:  
 Elle s'esuanouyt, puis estant reueuë  
 Frappe la tendre chair de sa poitrine nuë,  
 S'arrache les cheveux, tesmoins de son mechef,  
 Et de vilain fumier des-honore son chef.  
 Tenant en son giron l'amoureuse despouille,  
 L'eschaufe de soupirs, de ses larmes la mouille.

And Spenser may have read the repetitious lament of Venus, extending well over a hundred lines, in this strain:

Adonis parle à moy, & me viens consoler,  
 Baise moy pour adieu auant que t'en-aller.

Bion's *Lament* does not allude to the actual death of Adonis. Spenser, perhaps remembering the circumstances of Sidney's death, imagines that the dying Astrophel hears his mistress' lament. And (173-174):

At last when paine his vitall powres had spent,  
 His wasted life her weary lodge forwent.

Ronsard effects a similar change. Accordingly at the close of Venus' lament:

Luy tournant vers le ciel les yeux, fist un souspir,  
 Puis pressé de la mort il se laisse assoupir  
 Sans force & sans vigueur dans le bras de la belle,  
 Ainsi qu'on voit faillir sans cire une chandelle.

Professor Shafer<sup>16</sup> calls attention to the fact that unlike Venus, who mourns that she cannot follow her lover to Hades, Stella cements her bond to Astrophel by dying immediately; Spenser thus adds to the air of unreality that pervades the poem. The metamorphosis of their bodies "into one flowre that is both red and blew" faintly reflects Bion's account, echoed in Ronsard, of the similar change affecting Adonis' blood and Venus' tears:

du sang la belle fleur  
 De la Rose vermeille a portraict sa couleur,  
 Et du tendre crystal de mes larmes menues  
 Les fleurs des Coquerets blanches sont devenues.

---

her breasts with cruel hands." Either Ronsard or Ovid could account for Spenser's abbreviated version of the Adonis myth in *F. Q.* 3. l. 34-38. Cf. especially st. 38 and the foregoing passages.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 225.

Appropriately enough, Spenser refrains from indulging in Ron-sard's facetious conclusion. For Venus quickly forgets Adonis and adopts another lover:

Telles sont & seront les amitez des femmes,  
Qui au commencement sont plus chaudes que flames,  
Ce ne sont que souspirs, mais en fin telle amour  
Resemble aux fleurs d'Auril qui ne vivent qu'un iour.

T. P. HARRISON, JR.

*University of Texas*

---

### TREMELLIUS, SIDNEY, AND BIBLICAL VERSE

In establishing Milton's heavy dependence upon the Tremellius-Junius Bible <sup>1</sup> Professor Fletcher makes the provocative point that this text "is equally important for students of the period beginning about the middle of Elizabeth's reign until . . . the Interregnum."<sup>2</sup> Sidney, Bacon, Donne, and Wither,<sup>3</sup> taken at random, seem to confirm this and the further claim that the Tremellius version of the Old Testament became "almost as standard a Latin translation for the Protestant as the Vulgate . . . for the Catholic."<sup>4</sup> Certainly, "one catches . . . significant echoes" from it.<sup>4</sup> Sidney is a case in point.

In the very "middle of Elizabeth's reign" he identifies the first of the three kinds of poets as:

Dauid in his Psalmes, Salomon in his song of Songs, in his Ecclesiastes, and Prouerbs, Moses and Debora in theyr Hymnes, and the writer of Iob; which *beside other, the learned Emanuell Tremelius and Franciscus Iunius doe entitle the poeticall part of Scripture.*<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Fletcher, Harris, *The Use of the Bible in Milton's Prose* (Urbana, 1929), pp. 44-45; 49; 51-107.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> Sidney, "An Apology for Poetry," *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. Smith, I, 158; Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*, ed. Wright, p. 279; Donne, "The Lamentations of Jeremy, For the Most Part According to Tremellius," *Donne's Poetical Works*, ed. Grierson, II, 245; Wither, *Preparation to the Psalter* (Spenser Society, 37), p. 112.

<sup>4</sup> Fletcher, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> Sidney, *op. cit.*, I, 158. Italics here and later are mine. All references, unless otherwise indicated, are to this edition.

This echo is significant; but the significance has been overlooked because commentators have not found the authentic voice behind the echo. What Tremellius and Junius actually "*doe* entitle the poetick part of Scripture" cannot be found by ignoring the source, or by referring to sections or title pages of the poetic division.<sup>6</sup> It will be found only by examining the preface to the third division of the Bible—"the poetick part of Scripture." This is the authentic voice. The title pages<sup>8</sup> refer neither to "Moses and Debora in theyr Hymnes," nor to "other" poetical parts; the preface, in the underscored parenthesis, refers to both:

. . . hos libros omnes communiter vocamus Psalmos, quia sunt rythmici; non prosa oratione scripti, ut omnes alii (etsi in his *Cantica quaedam exstant elegantissima Moschis, Deborahae, Davidis, Jeschahjae, Jechizijae, Jirmejae, & Chabbakuki inspersa*) sed numeris adstricti ad commoditatem memoriae & cantus.<sup>9</sup>

Unquestionably, then, this, not the title page, is Sidney's source. This preface alone illuminates Sidney's meaning.

1. It explains the narrow scope of Sidney's list. This list is restricted to lyric verse. Patently, the author of "it is not rhyming and versing that maketh Poesie" could not believe rhythm to be an essential of biblical poetry, or all scriptural poetry to be lyric; his incidental references to the parables of Nathan and Christ

<sup>6</sup> Cf. eds. Feuillerat, Collins, Woodberry, Shuckburgh, Smith, Cook, Rhys, Quosseck, Arber, Young, Flügel, etc.

<sup>7</sup> *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra, Sive Libri Canonici* . . . [Latini recens ex Hebraeo facti brevibusque Scholiis illustrati ab Immanuele Tremellio & Francisco Iunio (Genevae, 1590)]. This is the earliest edition I have found available.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, A3: "Bibliorum Pars Tertia. Id est, Quinque Libri Poetici." "Libri III tomi Iob, Psalmi, Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Liber Canticorum."

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, "Praefatio, Pars Tertia." Shuckburgh (Cambridge, 1915, p. 81) alone notes this passage, but *not* in this connection, and *without* the all-important parenthesis. Shuckburgh's gloss is the conventional reference to the poetic volume and the title page (p. 87); the citation of the preface above comes in the incorrect interpretation of Sidney's belief that David's Psalms are "fully written in *meeter* as *all* learned Hebricians agree, although the rules be not yet fully found" (ed. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 155). The preface says nothing of "*meeter*"; the reference is not specifically to David's Psalms; "*meeter*" probably means the long *metrical* tradition with reference to David's Psalms, from Philo to Sidney's contemporaries. Cf. passages to notes 19-20.



prove this.<sup>10</sup> However, comprehending little of the (still moot) problem of Hebrew prosody,<sup>10</sup> he chose to rely upon the authority of "the learned" editors who found five books and scattered songs distinguished from all other poetry by rhythm [rythmici, non prosa oratione, ut omnes alii] for adaptation to song [numeris adstricti ad commoditatem memoriae & cantus]. Further:

Tertium [the editors' third division of Scripture] vero genus est *Psalmorum*, hoc est, librorum in quibus res a Mosche Prophetisque traditae & sancto Dei Spiritu testatae *aptis numeris* exponuntur . . . hi vero *numerosa* & brevi ad memoriam, figurata ad vim & efficacitatem oratione protulerunt eadem documenta voluntatis Dei . . . libros qui a Davidi *aliisque viris* Dei fuerunt traditi ut in Ecclesia *canerentur*, eos . . . *singulariter Psalmos dici & dicendos esse agnoscimus*; alios vero qui ita scripti sunt ut viri boni *cantare* potuerint eos & arbitrato suo *cantaverint* delectationis suae & institutionis ergo, *eos non minus proprie, sed communi voce confirmamus Psalmos appellari* . . . *Quid enim aliud est ψαλμός*, quam spirituale & sanctum scriptionis genus privatim, publice *canentium, psallentium, aut symphoniam, exercentium modulationi accommodum?*<sup>11</sup>

Thus, the list comprehends only the lyric *verse* of Scripture; rhythm, identified only with the lyric, [numeris adstricti commoditatem memoriae & cantus] does not clothe other genres; all rhythmic poetry is lyric.

2. Such restrictions give Sidney's canon qualitative as well as quantitative selectivity. Non-rhythmic poetry, exemplified by the parable,<sup>12</sup> "did imitate the inconceivable excellencies of god"<sup>12</sup> through the essential but sole instrumentality of idealized "counter-fetting, or figuring forth";<sup>12</sup> rhythmic (or lyric) poetry exemplified by David's Psalms, did so through both agencies—verse and invention,<sup>13</sup> or according to the preface,<sup>13</sup> "campages . . . numerorum & figurarum lumina." This rhythmic poetry, then, by virtue of adding to idealized fiction verse, "that fittest ray-

<sup>10</sup> Sidney, *op. cit.*, pp. 166-7; 173-5. The writer's recent article, "The Bible as Poetry in the English Renaissance: An Introduction," in *JEGP.*, xxxii, 458-60, explains Sidney's fundamental test of aesthetic and creative imitation as applied to the parable and various theories of Hebrew prosody current in the English Renaissance.

<sup>11</sup> Tremellius, *op. cit.*, "Praefatio, Pars Tertia."

<sup>12</sup> Sidney, *op. cit.*, p. 158. Cf. also note 10.

<sup>13</sup> Tremellius, *op. cit.*, "Praefatio, etc." Cf. also "numerosa . . . figurata ad vim & efficacitatem oratione," passage to note 11. Cf. Sidney, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-5: "holy David's Psalmes are a diuine Poem . . . [upon] the testimonie of great learned men, both auncient and moderne: but euen

ment"<sup>14</sup>. . . "which dooth most pollish that blessing of speech"<sup>14</sup> must be rarer not only in quantity (five books and a handful of poems) but in quality. It is "chief both in antiquitie and *excellencie*";<sup>15</sup> "haec poesis sacra est *elegantissima* Legis Prophetarumque epitome."<sup>15</sup> Thus, the surprisingly narrow list from the first great English literary critic. The fortuitous references to David's Psalms and to the parables, incidental illustrations of the high function of poetry, are simply suggestive of his grasp. A spirit so sensitive to aesthetic and spiritual values could not but have apprehended through translation the genuine poetic range of the Bible.

3.<sup>16</sup> It cannot be argued, however, that all dependents upon "this almost . . . standard . . . Latin translation for the Protestant" shared Sidney's keen discernment. It is therefore highly probable that the preface persuaded many—those insensitive to genuine poetic values and those still hostile to such values—that the small lyric verse list was the complete "poetic" canon.

4. The preface, too, probably restricted the meaning of "Psalm" in much of Elizabethan usage (excepting, of course, where the *Book of Psalms* was specifically mentioned) to biblical verse as distinguished from biblical prose<sup>17</sup> or to any rhythmic lyrical part of Scripture.<sup>18</sup>

the name Psalmes will speake for mee, which, being interpreted, is nothing but songes . . . [Cf. the suggestive similarity of this last with "Quid enim aliud est ψαλμός, quam spiritale & sanctum scriptionis genus . . . canentium"] that it is fully written in meeter . . . all learned Hebricians agree, although the rules be not yet fully found. Lastly and principally his handling his prophecy . . . is meere poetical. For what els is . . . his notable Prosopopoeias, when he maketh you, as it were, see Go<sup>d</sup> coming in his Maestie; his telling of the Beastes ioyfulness, and hills leaping, but a heauenlie poesie, wherein hee sheweth himselfe a passionate louer of that unspeakable and euerlasting beautie to be seen by the eyes of the minde, onely cleered by fayth?"

<sup>14</sup> Sidney, *op. cit.*, pp. 160 and 182, respectively.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158, and Tremellius, *op. cit.*, "Praefatio, etc."

<sup>16</sup> The following points are not meant to be interpreted as established conclusions. They are merely high probabilities to be tested by later research.

<sup>17</sup> Tremellius, *op. cit.*, "Praefatio, etc.": "Libros qui a Davidi aliisque viris Dei . . . singulariter Psalmos dici & dicendos esse agnoscimus . . . hos libros omnes communiter vocamus Psalmos, quia sunt rythmici; non propterea oratione scripti ut omnes alii. . . ."

<sup>18</sup> Cf. passages to notes 9 and 11.

5. Finally, the interpretation of "rhythm." Rhythm or "numbers" may have meant either (a) rhythm in the commonly understood loose sense of the word, or (b) a strict adherence to the quantity of the syllables of the foot, but not as in metre, to the order of the syllables or to the definite circle.<sup>19</sup> The quantitative interpreters of biblical prosody, starting with Philo<sup>20</sup> and Josephus, had established a Hebraic tradition of rhythm as contradistinguished from metre, and they were confirmed by patristic authority.<sup>21</sup> Hence, "rhythm" and "numbers" in the preface probably explained to many (and there *were* many during this period) with a reading acquaintance with Hebrew, the apparent unevenness of biblical verse. For example, if Moses' song (Deuteronomy 32), frequently designated as hexameter verse, be regarded as "hexameter rhythm," rather than "metre," thereby allowing for the indiscriminately scattered substitutions of anapests and spondees, in addition to the permissible variations of the strict metre, the undiscerning reader might well be misled; rhythm in its very loosest sense, of course, would explain everything even more easily. Either hypothesis will resolve many of the absurd contentions of contemporary secular criticism. The use of "rhythm" or "numbers" by this preface undoubtedly played a significant rôle in ironing out prosodic difficulties.<sup>22</sup>

ISRAEL BAROWAY

*New York University*

---

<sup>19</sup> Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory*, ix, iv, 46-50, tr. J. S. Watson (London, 1855, 2 vols.), II, 222-3.

<sup>20</sup> "De Vita Mosis," I, 5. Cf. Moses' knowledge of rhythm and metre: "... ρυθμικὴν . . . καὶ μετρικὴν θεωρεῖν . . ."

<sup>21</sup> Jerome, "Epistola ad Marcellam," *Patrologiae Latinae*, xxii, 434: "Quidam diapsalma commutationem metri dixerunt esse . . . sunt qui rythmi distinctionem" and Cassiodorus, "In Psalterium Praefatio," *P. L.*, op. cit., lxx, 19-20: "Haec . . . apud Hebraeos aut rythmo, aut metrica constat lege composita, quae ut ipsi dicunt, fastuciis continetur."

<sup>22</sup> However, Shuckburgh's gloss of Sidney's remark that David's Psalms are "fully written in *meeter*" as "all learned Hebricians agree" with "hos libros omneis communiter vocamus Psalmos, quia sunt *rythmici*; non prosa oratione scripti, ut omnes alii . . . sed numeris adstricti ad commoditatem memoriae et cantus" of the preface is erroneous. Cf. note 9.

## AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF DU BARTAS

The biographers of Guillaume Salluste, Sieur du Bartas, have always experienced difficulty in ascertaining the poet's movements during the last years of his life, from 1586 to 1590.<sup>1</sup> Their efforts to fix the exact dates of his sojourn in England and Scotland have met with little success.<sup>2</sup> His correspondence during this period, if it were available today,<sup>3</sup> would doubtless go far toward removing the uncertainties which prevail, but few of his letters have come down to us.

A letter which is preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek of Munich,<sup>4</sup> although disappointingly brief, lacks neither charm nor interest. It establishes the fact that at a definite date, July 16, 1587, the poet of the *Semaines* was enjoying the hospitality of James VI, king of Scotland, in his favorite residence.<sup>5</sup> It shows us the poet in a state of complete relaxation and perfect happiness.

<sup>1</sup> See Pellissier, *La vie et les œuvres de Du Bartas*, Paris, Hachette, 1882, and Harry Ashton, *Du Bartas en Angleterre*, Paris, Larose, 1908. It is to be hoped that the edition of Du Bartas by Professors Holmes and Lyons, of the University of North Carolina, which is ready for publication, will greatly supplement our knowledge of Du Bartas during the latter part of his life.

<sup>2</sup> Although Mr. Ashton thinks that Du Bartas made only one trip to England and Scotland, from 1586 to 1587, he has not succeeded in establishing definitely the dates of the poet's arrival and departure. (*Op. cit.*, p. 18 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> According to Haag, a number of Du Bartas' letters were once included in the manuscript collections of the Bibliothèque Nationale. They were never copied, however, and at the present time there is no trace of their existence. Cf. Ashton, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Collectio Camerariana*, Codex Latinis Monacensis 10383, fol. 207. The existence of this letter, together with others received by Josias Mercier, is pointed out by M. Pierre de Nolhac, *Ronsard et l'humanisme*, Paris, Champion, 1921, p. 218, note 1. Its presence in Munich is accounted for by the fact that Mercier had been obliged to seek refuge in Germany on account of his leanings toward Calvinism. He became an intimate friend of Camerarius, and many documents relative to the Mercier family, as well as to that of Jean de Morel, are now included in the *Collectio Camerariana*.

<sup>5</sup> This agrees with the conclusions of Mr. Ashton, who points out that Du Bartas was brilliantly received by James, who tried every possible means of persuading him to remain at his court.

He has thrown off all restraint and has given himself wholeheartedly to the pleasures of the hunt. We can have no doubt that, even though he did not accept the urgent invitation of James to remain permanently at his court, he found the pleasures of Falkland entirely to his liking.

This letter throws considerable light upon the undated letter from James VI to Du Bartas, published by Mr. Robert Sangster Rait<sup>6</sup> and cited by Mr. Ashton.<sup>7</sup> In it James writes: "... Je vous prie donques tres affectueusement de prendre tant de peine que de venir icy au commencement de l'esté prochain et mesme en may, s'il est possible' . . ." It is quite evident that James' letter was written not long before the poet's arrival, probably early in 1587.<sup>8</sup>

The letter is addressed to Josias Mercier, one of the poet's intimate friends. Mercier was a member of a family long associated with the progress of the Renaissance. The home of his grandmother, Antoinette de Loynes, wife of Jean de Morel, was known by the poets of the Pléiade as the "Temple of the Muses."<sup>9</sup> His father, Jean Mercier, succeeded the famous Vatable as professor of Hebrew at the Collège Royal and was considered the most learned Hebrew scholar of the time.<sup>10</sup> Josias Mercier himself, although less famous than his father, enjoyed a considerable reputation in his day as a "savant calviniste."<sup>11</sup> His daughter became the wife of the celebrated philologist, Claude Saumaise, thus carrying the influence of the family over into the seventeenth century.

Monsieur et frere, a ce que je voy vous nous avez oubliez. Pour mon regard il me seroit impossible d'oublier vre doctrine et vertu. Si vous

<sup>6</sup> In his *Lusus Regius*, Westminster, 1901-1902.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 20-22.

<sup>8</sup> It is to be recalled that Du Bartas had gone to Scotland to negotiate the marriage of Catherine, sister of Henri de Navarre, to James. I am indebted to Professors Holmes and Lyons for the information that he landed in England on May 5, 1587, and arrived in Scotland on May 25.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, *Eloges des hommes illustres*, mis en français par G. Colletet, Paris, 1644, pp. 292-294.

<sup>10</sup> Dupré-Lasale, *Michel de L'Hospital avant son élévation au poste de Chancelier de France*, Paris, 1875 et 1899, II, 41.

<sup>11</sup> La Croix du Maine, *Bibliothèque françoise*, Paris, 1772, édition avec notes manuscrites de Mercier de Saint-Léger, Bibliothèque Nationale, Rés. Q. 205-206, I, 548.

voulez sçavoir ce que nous faisons icy, nous chassons le temps a la chasse des daims et des lievres. Bref ma Calliope s'est changee en une Diane, laquelle vous aime plus que ne faisoit l'ancienne Endimion. A dieu ce 16 de juillet 1587.

Vre affectionné frere et serviteur

Du Bartas.

*Address on back:* A Monsieur Monsieur Mercier.

*Handwriting of Mercier:* Mr. Du Bartas / Fakland en Escosse<sup>12</sup> / 16 juillet calend. / de France<sup>13</sup> 1587.

Receue a Londres<sup>14</sup> / le 25 juillet, / calend de F.<sup>15</sup>

SAMUEL F. WILL

*University of Illinois*

### THE SHIFTING OF RESPONSIBILITY IN XVIIITH CENTURY FRENCH TRAGIC DRAMA

J'ai . . . pris soin de la rendre (Phèdre) un peu moins odieuse qu'elle n'est dans les tragédies des anciens, où elle se résout d'elle-même à accuser Hippolyte. . . . Cette bassesse m'a paru plus convenable à une nourrice. . . . (Racine, Pref. of *Phèdre*).

The scruple was not without precedent. If, for instance, in Seneca's *Hippolytus* Phaedra makes the accusation, yet the nurse conceived it. In the *Hypolite* of Gilbert the confidant perpetrates the entire machination.<sup>1</sup> Racine's solicitude was within the legend. It had a further warrant, that of *bienséance*:

les personnes . . . de naissance . . . ne se portent qu'à de hauts desseins . . . s'il y a (dans une tragédie) quelque Acte ou quelque Scène qui n'ait

<sup>12</sup> Falkland, the ancient fortress of the Macduffs, reverted to the crown in 1424 and became a hunting lodge of the king of Scotland. The château of Falkland was constructed by James V and became the favorite residence of James VI (James I of England, 1566-1625).

<sup>13</sup> The Gregorian calendar, which became effective in France in December, 1582, was not adopted in England until 1752.

<sup>14</sup> According to M. de Nolhac (*loc. cit.*), Mercier traveled in England and Germany during his youth and later became "conseiller d'État." I have not been able to determine whether his presence in London at this time was in an official capacity or merely as a visitor.

<sup>15</sup> The text of this letter is taken from a photostatic copy now in my possession.

<sup>1</sup> 1646. Cf. H. C. Lancaster, *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1932), II, 581.

pas cette conformité de mœurs avec les Spectateurs . . . on verra aussi-tôt l'applaudissement cesser.<sup>2</sup>

Phaedra's repudiation of her nurse, which Racine emphasizes, also had its tradition: to be repudiated after unhappy result of counsel had long been the pay of the confidant.

I propose to survey the penchant of xviii century French tragedy and tragi-comedy for shielding and retrieving the responsibility of prominent characters. Greek drama contains the sources of this convention. Euripides' Phaedra imputes to her nurse the artifice which the latter's indiscretion has made necessary:

I must find some new device, for this man . . . will accuse me to his father of thy sin. . . .<sup>3</sup>

To gossips is charged Hermione's persecution of Andromache:

"How then," shall one ask, "cam'st thou so to err?"  
'Twas pestilent women sought to me . . .<sup>4</sup>

The major share of Orestes' guilt is laid to Electra:

worthier of death than thou is she,  
Who egged thee on against thy mother . . .<sup>5</sup>

French pre-classical tragedy and tragi-comedy supply examples of extenuating the guilt of prominent personages and diverting blame to minor figures. Garnier's Phaedra carries out the deception planned by her nurse apparently to save the latter.<sup>6</sup> The breach of faith of King Sedecius Garnier explains by its origin:

la jeunesse ardante et prompte aux changemens  
Tousjours mist sous le pié nos amonnestemens;  
Si que mon fils [Sedecie], poussé de leurs voix indiscrettes  
Et des prédictions de quelques faux prophètes . . .<sup>7</sup>

Although he must include himself among the persecutors of Mariamne, Hardy's Herod indicts the "mal-veillans traistres"

<sup>2</sup> D'Aubignac, *Pratique du Théâtre* (1657), Paris, Champion, 1927, 74-75.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Four Plays of Euripides* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1931), p. 261.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Euripides* (New York, Putnam's Sons, 1919), II, 487.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, 177.

As a woman, Electra was a relatively inferior person; cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, xv.

<sup>6</sup> *Hippolyte*, iv. The nurse confesses her responsibility, iv.

<sup>7</sup> *Les Juifves*, III.

who plotted her death.<sup>8</sup> In Hardy's *Arsacome* the remorse of the Scythian ambassador who deserted a friend he had placed in jeopardy is alleviated by the realization that another friend must bear the brunt of the reproach:

Tu es pour la pluspart cause de ce malheur,  
Qui me dissuadas d'aller de force ouverte  
Préuenir du Heros l'irreparable perte.<sup>9</sup>

The shifting of responsibility descends to jugglery in two plays of Rotrou. Hermante, dishonored by the king of Epirus, attributes her lapse to the prompting of her nurse; her behavior indicates that she did not require much coaxing.<sup>10</sup> No more trustworthy is Don Flaminie, who enlists his valet in a fraud, the issue of which provokes the tirade: "Tes conseils m'ont perdu . . ." <sup>11</sup>

The theater of the classical period re-affirms the maxims: "Préserver nos héros du crime tant qu'il se peut," "Faire aimer nos principaux acteurs."<sup>12</sup> Its apportionment of responsibility is arbitrary. The transgressions of a major personage are usually imputable to a subaltern

dont tout le pouvoir ne sert qu'à faire horreur  
Et détruit, d'autant plus que plus on le voit croître,  
Ce que l'on doit d'amour aux vertus de son maître.<sup>13</sup>

When no exposure of influence is available, the dramatist resorts to diverse maneuvers: lynching of agents, undisputed denunciation of confidants, summary condemnation of counselors. Cor-

<sup>8</sup> *Mariamne*, v. Here, as in Tristan's *Mariane* (1636), v, 3, Herod's denunciation is not just: he decreed the death of Mariamne because he imagined she had been unfaithful (*Mariamne*, III; *la Mariane*, III, 2, 3).

<sup>9</sup> v, 2.

<sup>10</sup> *L'Innocente infidélité*, I, 2; IV, 4.

<sup>11</sup> *Célie, ou le Vice-Roi de Naples*, IV, 4. Flaminie had already pointed out that the valet was the originator of the ill-fated scheme; cf. IV, 3.

<sup>12</sup> Corneille, *Deuxième Discours sur le Poème Dramatique*.

<sup>13</sup> Corneille, *Othon*, I, 1. The faults of Emperor Galba are the doings of his ministers. In Th. Corneille's *Ariane* (1672) the perfidy of Phaedra is encouraged by Pirithous (III, 1). When there is historical proof of such influence, the dramatist may still exaggerate it; cf. Tristan, *Mort de Senèque* (1644), ed. J. Madeleine, Paris, Hachette, 1919. Tristan's Nero is less responsive than Tacitus' Nero to the suggestion that he kill Seneca; cp. I, 1; IV, 4; v, 4 with the passages of Tacitus' *Annals* cited by Madeleine, 102-103.



neille employs these tactics, and no better illustrations can, I believe, be found of their ruthlessness. For the first I note *Nicomède*, with its assassination of three subordinate characters, tools of King Prusias and Queen Arsinoë. The rehabilitation of king and queen is effected after Nicomède is freed by the murder of the guard sent to spirit him out of the country. The monarchs sanction the rescue in terms which need no comment:

parmi les douceurs qu'enfin nous recevons,  
Faites-nous savoir, prince, à qui nous vous devons.<sup>14</sup>

We shall consider the methods exploited in *Cinna* and *Pompée*. Adopting the suggestion that he betray Cinna's conspiracy and win Émilie for himself, Maxime has collaborated with his adviser. But Émilie's outburst of loyalty for Cinna puts him to shame, and the abortion of the device brings him to himself. He will atone for his guilt in Cinna's conspiracy if Augustus will punish the confidant who originated an artifice all the more treacherous for its failure and for uniting two persons it was to separate.<sup>15</sup> In the heat of exculpation he disowns his support of the conspiracy as well as the betrayal of it:

J'ai trahi mon ami, ma maîtresse, mon maître,  
Ma gloire, mon pays, par l'avis de ce traître.<sup>16</sup>

There is no evidence that the confidant inspired Maxime's disloyalty toward Augustus; nor is there denial: the confidant is not present as the charge is made.<sup>17</sup>

Achillas (*Pompée*) exhorts Ptolemy to neutrality in the quarrel between Caesar and Pompey:

Vous pouvez adorer César . . .  
Cette grande victime est trop pour son autel,  
Et sa tête immolée au dieu de la victoire

---

<sup>14</sup> v, 9.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. iv, 6; v, 3. An example of a king turning on a counselor after a disastrous conclusion of a scheme is found in Scudéry's *Eudoxe*; cf. Lancaster, *op. cit.*, Part II, i, 234.

<sup>16</sup> v, 3. For previous hint, cf. iv, 6.

<sup>17</sup> The conversation of III, 1 shows, on the contrary, that the confidant was not responsible for Maxime's association with Cinna. It may be added that the Maxime-Euphorbe feature of the play has no historical authority; cf. Lancaster, *op. cit.*, i, 315.

Imprime à votre nom une tache trop noire:  
Ne le pas secourir suffit sans l'opprimer.<sup>18</sup>

Ptolemy prefers Photin's view,<sup>19</sup> and orders Achilles to assassinate Pompey.<sup>20</sup> In avenging the crime Caesar spares Ptolemy. He explains his leniency by his regard for Cleopatra; the latter asserts that Caesar deplores Ptolemy's surrender to advisers,

ces lâches politiques  
Qui n'inspirent aux rois que des mœurs tyranniques.<sup>21</sup>

Out of consideration for himself, Ptolemy defends his lieutenants; out of consideration for Ptolemy, Caesar singles them out for retaliation.<sup>22</sup> Pompey's widow derides the discrepancy:

Aux mânes de Pompée il faut une autre offrande; <sup>23</sup>

she must needs be content when

Achillas et Photin ont reçu leurs salaires.<sup>24</sup>

The one concession made to Achilles, the fact that he dies "en défendant son maître," is begrudged as "une mort trop belle pour un traître." <sup>25</sup>

<sup>18</sup> I, 1.

<sup>19</sup> Photin tells Ptolemy what Ptolemy wants to hear; but his language, with such mottoes as

La timide équité détruit l'art de régner, I, 1,

is calculated to prejudice the audience.

<sup>20</sup> The account of the assassination (II, 2) is meant to cast the odium of the affair upon Achilles.

<sup>21</sup> IV, 2. An inkling of this apology occurs in Cleopatra's admonition to Ptolemy:

Affranchissez-vous d'eux et de leur tyrannie;

Rappelez la vertu par leurs conseils bannie . . . I, 3.

Cf., also, II, 1.

<sup>22</sup> The incongruity of a battle ostensibly waged against subaltern characters is felt by Caesar (IV, 5). Ptolemy fought by the side of his ministers, and Caesar's men were ordered to spare him. Thus the relative obscurity of Ptolemy in the second half of the play is due to the efforts made to save his prestige.

<sup>23</sup> V, 2.

<sup>24</sup> V, 4. It is true that Ptolemy's death—which "lui rend toute sa gloire"—makes further retaliation impossible.

<sup>25</sup> V, 3.

If one confidant is more ignominiously punished (put to death by an executioner), the other is more ostentatiously branded. Perhaps the ineffectual counselor is more blameworthy for bending to the king's will; certainly the degrading of Achilles facilitates the redeeming of Ptolemy.

I have found no better illustrations of the shifting of responsibility than those cited above; I wish, however, to point out two later plays in which the convention strikes more plainly perhaps at historical evidence. Racine palliates the cruelty of Nero by making the advice of a confidant the deciding factor in the first outbreak of the "monstre naissant." The provoking manner of the advice would fairly well account for its effectiveness:

Vous seriez libre alors, seigneur, et devant vous  
Ces maîtres orgueilleux fléchiraient comme nous.  
Quoi donc! ignorez-vous tout ce qu'ils osent dire! . . .<sup>26</sup>

The counselor further demonstrates his hand when, on his own initiative, he attempts to complete a deed in the midst of which Nero remains confounded.<sup>27</sup>

In *Le Comte d'Essex* Thomas Corneille distorts English history to provide a *sortie* for an eminent personage. Queen Elizabeth gives herself up to resentment with an abandon which makes her the fiercest of Essex's adversaries . . . and the most unreliable, since, in siding with those who seek his life, she is only combating his disdain for her love:

la raison d'état, en le privant du jour,  
Servira de prétexte à la raison d'amour.<sup>28</sup>

At the hour of the execution Essex's indifference has not abated, and the queen drops her unavailing threat. Her pardon arrives too late. She then imputes the earl's death to Lord Cecil, who, she affirms, carried out a warrant unsigned.<sup>29</sup>

The examples cited portray notable figures credulous and vacil-

<sup>26</sup> *Britannicus*, iv, 4. The sole justification for the rôle of Narcisse is the statement of Tacitus (*Annals*, XIII, 1) that in Narcisse there were, fully developed, the vices which were still hidden in Nero; cf. First Pref. of *Britannicus*.

<sup>27</sup> v, 8.

<sup>28</sup> III, 4.

<sup>29</sup> Voltaire did justice of this subterfuge; cf. L. Alfreda Hill, *The Tudors in French Drama*, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, p. 140.

lating, susceptible to influence and prompt in disavowal, engaging in evil as a digression from their intrinsic nature and swerving back from disappointment over the profits of mischief. They are, moreover, aided in safeguarding or regaining their prestige. The shifting of responsibility to minor figures is a matter of etiquette in which, by direction or indirection, the entire cast collaborates. It is done at the expense of evidence (within the play or without), of adequacy in requital, of the coherence and the relief of the personages favored. It explains, in part at least, why in XVIIth century French drama the malefactor seldom displays the steadfastness of a Don John (*Much Ado About Nothing*) or an Edmund (*King Lear*) and why, in particular, the transgressing monarch does not reach the stature of a Macbeth or a Claudius.

New York University

MAURICE BAUDIN

### MILTON, JONSON, AND THE YOUNG COWLEY

The unpublished manuscript of Nicholas Oldisworth's *A Recollection of Certain Scattered Poems*, recently acquired by the Bodleian Library, contains a poem of only four lines in length which is of some interest because of the light it may cast upon two vexed questions concerning the literary relationships of Abraham Cowley: his early influence on John Milton, and his personal acquaintance with Ben Jonson. It also suggests certain facts connected with the composition and publication of his own first book. The quatrain reads as follows:

#### ON ABRAHAM COWLEY THE YONG POËT LAUREAT.

Ben Johnson's wombe was great; and wee  
Did doubt, what might the issue bee:  
But now he brings forth to his praise,  
And loe, an Infant crown'd with Baies.<sup>1</sup>

The "issue" is undoubtedly Cowley's *Poetical Blossoms*, the first known edition of which is dated 1633. But the complete title of Oldisworth's MS., prepared by himself for the press, continues thus: "Written Long Since by an Undergraduate, Being One of

<sup>1</sup> See p. 116 of MS.

the Students of Christ Church in Oxford, and Now in the Year 1644 Transcribed by the Author and Dedicated to His Wife." Young Oldisworth, the grandson of Sir Nicholas Overbury and the nephew of Sir Thomas Overbury,<sup>2</sup> entered Christ Church in 1628 as a King's Scholar from Westminster School and received his B. A. on April 24, 1632.<sup>3</sup> These dates are important if Oldisworth's statements about writing his poems while an undergraduate are worth anything. Moreover, virtually all the poems in the collection which can be dated were written between 1629 and 1632.<sup>4</sup> If this evidence can be at all trusted, it at least raises some doubts as to the date of the public appearance (if not actual publication) of Cowley's first work.

Perhaps the whole question becomes most interesting, however, when attention is focused upon its bearing on one of John Milton's best known minor poems, the sonnet commonly entitled "On His Having Arrived at the Age of Twenty-Three," the underlined

<sup>2</sup> See *DNB*. under "Giles Oldisworth."

<sup>3</sup> These seem to be the facts, although there are some peculiarities in the records of most of the Westminster Scholars of this time. According to Joseph Welch, *Alumni Westmonasterienses* . . . (London, 1852), p. 100, Oldisworth was "Elected to Oxford, A. D. 1628." The fact that he went up to the university almost at once, although his formal matriculation did not occur until a surprisingly long time later, is proved by the Buttery Books of Christ Church, in which, on July 4, 1628, during the fourth week of the term, the entry "Owleworth—iij s. ij d." is found at the side of the other names, as if it were an addition. These entries then continue regularly as "Owleworth," "Owleswoorth," etc., through 1631. The Buttery Book for the beginning of 1632 is missing, but the earliest for that year, commencing on September 14, omits his name. The reason is obvious, since on February 24, 1631/2, he had at last officially matriculated, and on April 24, 1632, at the age of twenty, he was granted his B. A. (See Welch, p. 101, and Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* (Oxford, 1891), vol. III, early series—both references having been checked directly with the University Registers.) He had therefore left Oxford as an undergraduate by the end of April—if not earlier, since the period of his stay had already been slightly longer than was required. The peculiar discrepancy between the dates of his entry and his matriculation I have not been able to explain; but the academic careers of other Westminster Scholars parallel his.

<sup>4</sup> His poem "On the Birth of James, Duke of York" (an event occurring on October 15, 1633) is an exception, but the fact that this poem was not a part of the original group is suggested by its having been included, along with some Latin verses by the same author, among the series of poems written by Oxford men upon this occasion (see Welch, p. 101).

phrases of which, as first pointed out by Gosse, who was supported by Grosart,<sup>5</sup> are decidedly mysterious:

How soon hath Time, the subtle thief of youth,  
 Stolen on his wing my three and twentieth year!  
 My hasting days fly on with full career,  
 But *my late spring no bud or blossom shew'th*.  
 Perhaps my semblance might deceive the truth,  
 That I to manhood am arrived so near,  
 And *inward ripeness doth much less appear*,  
 That some more timely-happy spirits *endur'th*. . .

The date of this sonnet is of course December 9, 1631, or thereabouts. Could Milton have heard of the *Poetical Blossoms* and its precocious young author, born in 1618, at this time? One of the chief objections to this interpretation has naturally been the dates. In another place I have already presented the previously known evidence for thinking that 1633, the apparent date of publication of Cowley's book, should not be taken as the actual date when the name of the "yong poët laureat" became known to many readers.<sup>6</sup> Briefly summarized, the case is based upon the following points: Thomas Sprat's statement in his life of Cowley, some thirty-five years later, "In the thirteenth year of his age came forth a little book under his name"; Cowley's own reference in "Of Myself" to an ode which was written "when I was but thirteen years old, and which was then printed with many other verses"; the sentence in Benjamin Masters's commendatory poem,

Nor yet was Cato's judgment at thirteen  
 So great as thine;

and the phrase "Aetat: suae 13" which Robert Vaughan placed upon his engraving of Cowley's portrait for use in the volume which seemingly was being prepared for the press and probably being circulated in MS. as early as 1631, although it did not actually get into print until 1633.<sup>7</sup>

Nicholas Oldisworth, even though he was then an undergraduate

<sup>5</sup> A. Grosart, *Complete Works . . . of Abraham Cowley* (Edinburgh, 1881), I, xliii.

<sup>6</sup> See my *Abraham Cowley* (Oxford, 1931), pp. 22-23.

<sup>7</sup> Entry was made upon the Stationers' Registers on October 19, 1632, and the license of Sir Henry Herbert was granted on the same date. Cf. Jean Loiseau, *Abraham Cowley . . .* (Paris, 1931), p. 39.

at Oxford, might well have followed Cowley's career in London, for Cowley was at that time a King's Scholar at Westminster School, where Oldisworth had studied before him; moreover, in their poems and acknowledgments both young poets respectfully mention Lambert Osbalston, the head master—a man with an unusual interest in the composition of poetry by his students. Oldisworth's epigram, then, with its probable date of 1631 or 1632, may lend additional support to the speculation that Cowley's *Poetical Blossoms* had been given to a fairly wide public before its official printing and that this work by a school-boy author was at least partly responsible for the melancholy mood in which Milton wrote the octave of his birthday sonnet.<sup>8</sup>

But whether or not the proof of such an indirect relationship between Cowley and Milton at this stage of their careers be acceptable, Oldisworth's casual lines with very little doubt give the answer to another widely discussed but previously unsolved problem: Did Cowley actually know Ben Jonson? The probabilities, of course, have all been in favor of the affirmative.<sup>9</sup> For instance, Ben had been living in Westminster since 1628, if not earlier,<sup>10</sup> and Cowley's school was not far off. Moreover, William Cartwright, one of old Ben's favorite "Sons," had himself been a Westminster boy, and could hardly have refrained from introducing this new prodigy to his master. Lord Clarendon, who as simple Edward Hyde had been another favorite Son, has also said that Cowley had ascribed much of his "flight beyond all men . . . to the example and learning of Ben Jonson."<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless among all the names of Jonson's circle, young men and old, but mostly about the age of twenty, that of the boy Cowley has never before appeared,

<sup>8</sup> The continuation of Milton's admiration for Cowley is of course well known. Cf. my *Abraham Cowley*, pp. 23, 51-2, and 155, for a summing up.

<sup>9</sup> In 1836, in fact, an author signing himself "Father Prout" pretended that he had found a series of Cowley's lost familiar letters, among which was one describing a visit of Cowley to Jonson in 1637; these forgeries were printed in *Fraser's Magazine*, XIII (April, 1836), 395-406, and XIV (August, 1836), 234-41. Their authorship is discussed by Grosart in *The Athenaeum* for July 17, 1897, p. 99.

<sup>10</sup> See C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, *Ben Jonson* (Oxford, 1925), I, 98 n., 102. Oldisworth's poem, "Iter Australe," also confirms this fact; Herford and Simpson are aware of this poem, but attribute it to *Michael* Oldisworth instead of *Nicholas* Oldisworth (p. 113 n.).

<sup>11</sup> Clarendon, *Life* . . . (Oxford, 1827), I, 34.

although at least two of his friends and patrons, who shortly after are mentioned frequently in connection with him, are found there; these are Lord Falkland and Sir Kenelm Digby.<sup>12</sup> Before the present time, the chief proof of Clarendon's assertion of Jonson's influence has resided implicitly in Cowley's comedy of humors, *The Guardian*, later revised as *Cutter of Coleman Street*. Now Oldisworth's quatrain links the old and the young poet indisputably. There can be little question of the acquaintance of the two. Oldisworth's lines, however, go a great deal farther. They even indicate that Cowley was almost a disciple of the great Ben. Interpreted, they imply that *Poetical Blossoms* was ushered into the world under Jonson's protection—that Jonson had made a sort of mystery of the forthcoming collection and had then produced the new poet to the applause of his group.

To summarize, even though *Poetical Blossoms* was very probably not published until 1633, it was pretty clearly being circulated as early as 1631. Abraham Cowley, at the age of thirteen or so, was already "the yong poët laureat" to the old poet laureate and his circle, and had also in all likelihood aroused an ill-repressed envy in the bosom of the future author of *Paradise Lost*. What more auspicious beginning could the most ambitious young writer have asked for?

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

*Northwestern University*

# MILTON, *LYCIDAS* AND PROPERTIUS, *ELEGIES*, III, 7

The sources of *Lycidas* have been treated in considerable detail<sup>1</sup> but it is my belief that too little attention has been devoted to the elegiac tradition. This is not to deny the importance of the pastoral influence of Theocritus, Moschus, Vergil, Sannazaro, and Spenser. The elegiac sources may be identified with some confidence, for there are in Milton clearer echoes of his reading than Hanford<sup>2</sup> seems to allow.

<sup>12</sup> Herford and Simpson, I, 112, 109.

<sup>1</sup> See D. H. Stevens, *Reference Guide to Milton*, Nos. 272, 301, 588-618.

<sup>2</sup> A *Milton Handbook*, 1929, 127 (in connection with the sources of *Comus*), "Milton's borrowings, here and elsewhere, are never literal.



At one time Milton was an enthusiastic imitator of the elegists, for he says in the *Apology for Smectymnus*:<sup>3</sup>

"... others were the smooth elegiac poets, ... which in imitation I found most easy. ... I was so allured to read, that no recreation came to me better welcome ... they could esteem themselves worthiest to love those high perfections, which under one or other name they took to celebrate."

It is clear from Milton's words that he had Tibullus and Propertius in mind though he nowhere names them. He does mention Ovid,<sup>4</sup> Catullus,<sup>5</sup> and Gallus<sup>6</sup> elsewhere. Milton's reference to elegiac pseudonyms strengthens the case for his familiarity with Tibullus and Propertius<sup>7</sup> since Apuleius (*Apol.* 10) gives us no real name for Ovid's Corinna though he supplies this information in the case of the other elegists.

The English conception of elegy (largely due to Gray's influence) is so prevalent that we are likely to forget that the term was not thus used by the ancients. The typical Augustan elegy was erotic and it was the erotic elegy which chiefly interested Milton at the time. However, other types of Roman elegy do occur and in Propertius there are several examples of the threnetic. One of these, III, 7, *On the drowning of Paetus*, deserves consideration because of its possible relation to *Lycidas*. My purpose here does not require the demonstration of verbal reminiscences; it is enough to

Even when we are reasonably sure of his indebtedness the relation is apt to be so distant and intangible that one feels that his recollection must have been an unconscious one."

<sup>3</sup> See the whole passage, Hanford, *op. cit.* 274.

<sup>4</sup> *Elegy* I, 22; *Elegy* VI, 19.

<sup>5</sup> *Ad Joannem Rousium*, note.

<sup>6</sup> *Mansus*, 4.

<sup>7</sup> The story of Hylas is found in many ancient authors but the Miltonic expression, *Elegy* VII, 24: *Thiodamantaeus Hylas*, can be found among the Romans only in Propertius, I, 20, 6. Apollonius, *Argonautica*, I, 1207 ff. does supply the father's name, but not the adjectival form. Jerram cites three verbal parallels to Propertius, *Lycidas*, 166, "For Lycidas, your sorrow, is not dead," and Propertius, I, 14, 18, *Illā etiam duris mentibus esse dolor*; *Epitaphium Damonis*, 73, *ista canunt surdo*, and Propertius, IV, 8, 47, *cantabant surdo*; *Epitaphium Damonis*, 79, *Saturni grave saepe fuit pastoribus astrum*, and Propertius IV, 1, 84, *et grave Saturni sidus in omne caput*. To these may be added *Lycidas*, 164, "And, o ye dolphins, waft the hapless youth," and Propertius, II, 26, 17, *sed tibi subsidio delphinum currere vidi*.

indicate similarities in mood and technique between the work of Milton and Propertius.

Before examining the two poems a brief summary of Propertius' elegy will be convenient:

Money, you are the source of man's woes. You drowned Paetus and left his mother no corpse to bury. Winds and waves, who snatched him away in the night, Agamemnon learned your ruthlessness. Restore his body that his tomb may warn others. Mankind will not cease to venture on the sea. Paetus too would be alive had he been content with rustic simplicity. Hear his dying cry as the waves washed over him. Why did you not save him Nereids? Never will I venture on the sea, love will be my pursuit.

Certain resemblances in the two poems are due to coincidence. Each poet was writing in memory of a young<sup>8</sup> acquaintance who had been drowned. This very fact is likely to have reminded Milton of Propertius' treatment of the same theme. One feature of *Lycidas* may be connected most closely with the elegy on Paetus; the use of digressions in connection with an epicede. Propertius reflects on the curse of greed and the folly of seafaring. Both topics are related to the death of Paetus, but show the same sort of shift of the poet's interest that we find in Milton's digressions on Fame and on the Church. The poet allows his own reflections to obscure the main object of the poem. The fact that Edward King had intended to take orders in the Church scarcely justifies Milton's attack, and precedent for including references to the Church has been sought in many of the pastorals of the century or two preceding.<sup>9</sup> The existence of these earlier references to the church may account for the subject matter of the digression, but the incorporation of such elements in a lament is better accounted for by the form of Propertius' elegy than by the assumption that Milton is simply following the pastoral tradition. The apparent lack of sympathy for King's chosen profession is equalled only by Propertius' cynical contempt for the occupation which caused Paetus' death. The mood which governs the digressions is in both cases strikingly the same. Each poet uses elaborate technical devices in order to create an opportunity to treat subjects of real interest to him. Propertius personifies money in order to accomplish the transition

<sup>8</sup> Cf. "Young Lycidas" (9) and *miseros primae lanuginis annos* (59).

<sup>9</sup> e. g. Mantuan, Spenser, and Fletcher.

and Milton appeals to the Muse who suggests the theme of Fame through the reference to her son <sup>10</sup> Orpheus. Again Propertius shifts to the second person to introduce his reflections on death by drowning as Milton introduces the attack on the Church in Peter's address.

The conclusion of each poem has the same emphasis. The poet turns to himself and with no expression of feeling for the dead considers his own course. Milton's "fresh Woods" and "Pastures new" may or may not indicate some more lofty goal but it is no less personal than Propertius' intention of remaining the idle poet of love.

On the basis of these structural similarities it is worth while to notice certain turns of phrase which may well indicate that Milton's indebtedness to Propertius included verbal echoes.<sup>11</sup> With *Lycidas*, 100, 102:

It was that fatal and perfidious bark . . .  
That sunk so low that sacred head of thine

compare III, 7, 16:

*portabat sanctos alveus ille viros.*

Each poet stresses the fact that the drowned man was 'righteous' and deserved divine protection which he failed to receive. The same image is incorporated in the following passages, *Lycidas*, 50:

. . . when the remorseless deep  
Closed o'er the head of your loved Lycidas

and III, 7, 56:

*cum moribunda niger clauderet ora liquor.*

The inability of Orpheus' mother to aid him is perhaps suggested by the treatment of Paetus' mother; *Lycidas*, 58-60:

What could the Muse herself that Orpheus bore,  
The Muse herself, for her enchanting son,  
Whom universal Nature did lament.

---

<sup>10</sup> She was also the 'mother' of Lycidas who "knew himself to sing, and build the lofty rhyme." In both poems the emphasis is maternal not erotic.

<sup>11</sup> Professor C. G. Osgood, with whom I have discussed this paper, suggests that careful reading of Propertius' elegy will indicate other echoes, too intangible for demonstration, but none the less real.

and III, 7, 9, 10:

*Et mater non iusta piaē dare debita terrae  
nec pote cognatos inter humare rogos.*

There are certainly many differences in the two poems. There is nothing in Propertius parallel to the pastoral element in Milton; nothing in Milton resembling the dying speech of Paetus. The theme, the reproach of the Nymphs, the interrogation of waves and winds, and the blame attaching to the ships may be coincidences or commonplaces. Nevertheless, certain features of *Lycidas* show that Milton was influenced by Propertius' poem on a similar theme.

F. R. B. GODOLPHIN

*Princeton University*

---

#### MILTON'S RULES FOR *-ED*

In her admirable introduction to *The Manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost Book I* (1931), Miss Helen Darbishire states as the second of her conclusions regarding Milton's purposes in spelling the fact that he depended on spelling to give the "right metrical reading." Under this category she gives Milton's rules for the spelling of final *-ed* of preterite and past participle. There are three: (a) When *e* is required to indicate a metrical syllable he spells *-ed*; (b) when *e* is required to indicate, not a metrical syllable, but the length of the preceding vowel, or the soft pronunciation of *g* or *c*, he omits *e* and indicates its omission by an apostrophe; (c) when *e* is not required for either of these purposes he omits it and dispenses with the apostrophe (p. xxxi). Unquestionably the first rule is correct; but the second and the third excite some doubt. Miss Darbishire admits that neither the amanuenses nor the printers found it easy to carry through "these exacting distinctions," and says that "the printed text presents many inconsistencies"; but she thinks that Milton's intentions are clear. What are the facts?

In the first edition of Book I,<sup>1</sup> there are 172 examples of the use of the apostrophe with *d* in preterites and past participles. There

<sup>1</sup> I have used *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, ed. Beeching (1900), in which *Paradise Lost* is reprinted from the first edition.

are 38 cases in which the apostrophe is omitted.<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the following words are spelled both with and without the apostrophe: *equal'd* (40, 488), *equald* (248); *joyn'd* (577), *joynd* (90); *scatter'd* (325), *scatterd* (304). The word *followed* is spelled both with -ed (238) and with the apostrophe (467), but is metrically dissyllabic in both cases. In a rather large number of words the apostrophe does not indicate a preceding long vowel: *equal'd* (40), *witness'd* (57), *answer'd* (127), *wing'd* (175), and so on. On the other hand, the apostrophe is sometimes omitted after a long vowel or diphthong: *rowld* (223), *obeyd* (337), *upreard* (532), *assayd* (619). In short, the evidence from the first edition of Book I does not clearly establish rules (b) and (c). The same statement is true of the second edition.

In the Manuscript of Book I there are 179 examples of preterites and past participles spelled with the apostrophe. There are 34 examples in which the apostrophe is omitted. The following words are spelled both with and without the apostrophe: *equall'd* (488, 719), *equalld* (40, 248); *wing'd* (674), *Wingd* (175); *call'd* (82, 340, 405, 438, 757), *calld* (300, 314); *scatter'd* (325), *scattered* (304); *rais'd* (99), *Raisd* (44); *joyn'd* (577), *Joynd* (90). In the Manuscript, as in the printed edition, the apostrophe frequently does not indicate a preceding long vowel. To the examples cited from the first edition I may add the following from the Manuscript: *swallow'd* (142), *shatter'd* (232), *fewell'd* (234), *condens'd* (429), *borrow'd* (483), *fill'd* (495), *doubl'd* (616), *illumin'd* (666). Sometimes after a long vowel or diphthong, the apostrophe is omitted: *rowld* (223), *Regained* (270). Thus, the Manuscript, which Miss Darbishire (p. xix) says is the work of a scrupulously careful scribe, does not indicate a clear distinction between forms using the apostrophe and those omitting it. If Milton really intended to discriminate between these forms, his amanuenses apparently failed to carry out his purpose.

With regard to the use and the omission of the apostrophe with preterite and past participle, there is some valuable evidence in the anonymous life of Milton, which with much probability Miss Darbishire assigns to Milton's nephew John Phillips.<sup>3</sup> In this Life,

<sup>2</sup> Final -t, as in the words *vanquisht*, *mixt*, *rackt*, is counted as equivalent to final -d.

<sup>3</sup> *The Early Lives of Milton* (London, 1932), pp. xvi ff.

which Miss Darbishire reprints from Bodl. MS. Wood, D4 (*ibid.*, p. 337), it is interesting to observe how unstressed *-ed* is treated. In 104 examples the apostrophe is used with *d*. In 19 cases the apostrophe is omitted. The following words are spelled both with and without the apostrophe: *liv'd* (19, 21, 27, 33), *livd* (22); *return'd* (21), *returnd* (21); *receiv'd* (19), *receivd* (31); *express'd* (20), *expressd* (31); *call'd* (27), *calld* (22), *happen'd* (24), *happend* (33); *Regain'd* (29), *regaind* (29). Here also the apostrophe frequently does not indicate a preceding long vowel: *skill'd* (19), *practis'd* (20), *offer'd* (22), and so on. It may be added that the proportion of apostrophes omitted to those used, roughly one to six, is not far different from that in the first edition and in the Manuscript. In the Life, the omission of the apostrophe does not seem to be significant; in fact, the omission seems to be merely a matter of chance. I think that the same statement applies to the omission of the apostrophe in *Paradise Lost*. Moreover, why should the apostrophe be used after a long vowel? Readers had no need of this mark as a guide to pronunciation. I conclude that the apostrophe was not used for this purpose. Therefore, in place of rules (b) and (c), I propose this one: Milton used the apostrophe with *d* to indicate the omission of a metrical syllable. The omission of the apostrophe is accidental and meaningless.

Finally, it is obvious that John Phillips' treatment of *-ed* in this Life is almost parallel with that in *Paradise Lost*, Book I. Although there is no external proof that as an amanuensis John, as well as Edward, had a share in *Paradise Lost*, the similarity pointed out here might favor the idea that he had.<sup>4</sup> Miss Darbishire says that the Manuscript scribe, "a scrupulously careful copyist," did not write from dictation but "transcribed from a written text. . . ." <sup>5</sup> In the light of Miss Darbishire's proof that John Phillips kept in touch with his uncle, and probably visited him often, it is not unreasonable to suppose that John was one of the amanuenses who prepared the "written text" of *Paradise Lost*.

*The Rice Institute*

GEORGE W. WHITING

<sup>4</sup>In Edward's Life of his uncle I have not found one example of an apostrophe omitted before *d*. In several words the apostrophe is omitted before *t*.

<sup>5</sup>*The Manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost Book I*, p. xviii.

## THE DATE OF NAHUM TATE'S DEATH

Everyone who has attempted to ascertain the precise date of the death of Nahum Tate seems to have allowed himself to become confused. Whincop, Chetwood, and Cibber simply set down the year, 1716. *DNB.* follows the *Biographia Dramatica* in giving August 12, 1715. Ward and the *Cambridge History* give only the year 1715, and more recent editors are equally vague, the most puzzling information being in Broadus,<sup>1</sup> who presents two different dates on pages which face one another—July 23, 1715 (p. 98), and July 30, 1715 (p. 99). He repeats July 23, 1715, on page 106.

An examination of the evidence proves that the poet died on July 30, 1715. In arriving at this conclusion, the method has been to refer to contemporary journals, and where these are not in agreement, to select the earliest date, on the assumption that the death of the poet would not be announced as long as he was alive, and to examine every other date to determine how such erroneous suggestions came to be first made. The earliest announcement occurs in *The Weekly Packet*, No. 161, from *Saturday, July 30, to Saturday, August 6, 1715*:

Nahum Tate, departed this Life on Saturday last, and will, it is said, be succeeded by Mr. John Dennis, one of the King's Waiters at the Custom-House. (pp. [1-2].)

This statement is confirmed by an item in *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, VIII, 518:

The following *morceau* from *The Weekly Journal*, with *Fresh Advices Foreign and Domestick*, August 6, 1715, deserves the space it will occupy in your columns in a note:—

This day 7 Night died Nathaniel (*sic*!) Tate, Esq., who succeeds Mr. Shadwell as Poet Laureat . . . 'Tis believed Nicholas Row, Esq., will succeed him.

Broadus, himself, quotes a third source, *The British Weekly Mercury*, July 30 to August 6, 1715: "On Saturday Morning last, dy'd Nahum Tate, Poet-Laureat."<sup>2</sup> In the light of these contem-

<sup>1</sup> Broadus, Edmund Kemper, *The Laureateship in England* (Oxford, 1921).

<sup>2</sup> Broadus, Edmund, *The Laureateship*, p. 99n.

porary announcements, it is plain that the date of Tate's death is July 30, 1715, even without the final and conclusive proof that the register of St. George's, Southwark, has the following entry: "Aug. 1, 1715, Nahum Tate, next to Prince Eugene, the Mint."<sup>3</sup> Broadus's mistake in presenting the date on two occasions as July 23, is easily understood. He has simply counted back seven days from the *earlier* date of the period covered by each journal, rather than from the date of publication. This error has fixed the date one week too early.

To understand the second error, which suggests August 12, 1715, it is necessary to return to primary sources. *The Weekly Packet*, No. 163, August 13 to August 20, 1715, carries this announcement:

Nicholas Rowe, Esq., appointed Poet-Laureat, in the Room of N. Tate, Esq., deceas'd on the 12th Instant took the Usual Oath before the Duke of Bolton, Lord Chamberlain of his Majesty's Household. (p. 2.)

That this date is erroneous is clear from the same journal, No. 161, of two weeks earlier, August 6; and there is still further evidence in No. 162, for the period from Saturday, August 1 to Saturday, August 13: "Nicholas Row and John Dennis, Esqs., are made Poet-Laureat and Histiographer to his Majesty." (p. 3.) It is self-evident that if Tate had died but on the twelfth instant, the journal which appeared upon the following day could never have carried such an announcement. It must have taken at least a few days to appoint even a Laureate.

The third error is a more serious one, involving, as it does, the year as well as the day, and having had as its consequences, from Doctor Johnson's time on, considerable confusion about Tate's final status as Laureate and the appointment of his successor. Once again, the blunder may be traced to a contemporary—or near-contemporary—source. This time it is the *Poetical Register* for 1719 that is at fault: ". . . He [Tate] died in the *Mint*, Anno 1716, and was interr'd in St. *George's* Church, Southwark." (p. 255.) It has been the popular assumption that contemporary evidence would be trustworthy, and, accordingly, a dozen biographers have been led astray over the last two centuries.

The consequence has been that Tate has shared with Dryden the unenviable reputation of having been the only Laureates who, dur-

<sup>3</sup> *Notes and Queries*, Fifth Series, XI, 100.



ing their lives, lost the official appointment. Rowe succeeded on August 12, 1715, and according to the *Register*, Tate must have lived for at least some months longer. Doctor Johnson, himself, was deceived thus:

At the accession of King George he [Rowe] was made poet-laureate; I am afraid by the ejection of poor Nahum Tate, who (1716) died in the Mint, where he was forced to seek shelter by extreme poverty.<sup>4</sup>

Acadia University

H. F. SCOTT-THOMAS

---

### GOLDSMITH'S TRANSLATION OF THE ROMAN COMIQUE

In December, 1775,<sup>1</sup> a year and a half after Goldsmith's death, the publisher Griffin issued *The Comic Romance of Monsieur Scarron, translated by Oliver Goldsmith*.<sup>2</sup> The authenticity of this unevenly written and badly printed work has been questioned from the very beginning. Griffin himself led the way in the first sentence of his 'Address to the Public': 'The following translation, (a few sheets excepted) was executed by the late Dr. Goldsmith.' He then proceeds with glowing praise for Goldsmith's work, comparing it most favorably with its predecessor the often reprinted translation of Brown, Savage, and others, and in concluding he explains that since the third part was not written by Scarron it has been handled by the translator with great freedom. This whole statement was received with caution by the contem-

<sup>4</sup> Johnson, Samuel, *Works* (1810), x, 66.

<sup>1</sup> This date of publication is open to question. 'In a few days will be published' advertisements appeared in the *Whitehall Evening Post* for Dec. 2-5, 1775, and in other newspapers from then until Dec. 21. 'This day is published' advertisements appeared in *Lloyd's Evening Post* for Feb. 19-21, 1776, and in other newspapers from then until March 9. The work was listed among new books in the Dec., 1775, issues of the *Gentlemen's Magazine* and the *London Magazine*, and was reviewed in the *London Review*, Dec., 1775, the *Critical Review*, Jan., 1776, and the *Monthly Review*, July, 1776. The first reviewers may have received advance copies a month or more before public sale.

<sup>2</sup> For full collation see Iolo A. Williams, *Seven XVIIIth Century Bibliographies*, 1924, pp. 169-70, or Temple Scott, *Oliver Goldsmith*, 1928, pp. 341-2; neither mentions press numbers, cf. *infra*, p. 176.

porary reviewers, and the correctness of the attribution to Goldsmith has been treated with some incredulity ever since,<sup>3</sup> but until recently no attempt was made to verify or disprove it.

The first thorough examination of Griffin's claim was made by Mr. A. L. Sells in 1924.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Sells assigned to Goldsmith only the first nine chapters, and, tentatively, the novel, 'The Rival Brothers.' Mr. Sells based his conclusions on his detection of various minor errors and inconsistencies, and on his knowledge of Goldsmith's style. His conclusions are fairly sound—it will be seen later that the first seven chapters can properly be called Goldsmith's, though nothing else in the book is really his—but he could have attained both greater precision and greater assurance if he had not neglected the one thing needful, the comparison of Goldsmith's translation with its predecessor,<sup>5</sup> the work of Brown and Savage.<sup>6</sup> Such a comparison is revealing. Let us begin with the first sentence in each version.

Bright Phoebus had already *performed* above half his Career; and his Chariot having past the Meridian, and got on the *Declivity* of the Sky, rolled on swifter than he desired. Had his Horses been willing to have made use of the Slopingness of the Way, they might have finished the Remainder of the Day in less than half a Quarter of an Hour: But instead of pulling amain, they curvetted about, snuffing a briny Air, which set them a neighing, and made them sensible that they were near the Sea, where their Father is said to take his Rest every Night. To speak more

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the reviewers cited in n. 1, also Goldsmith's *Poetical Works*, ed. Bolton Corney, 1845, p. 200, and *Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. J. W. M. Gibbs, 1884-6, 5 vols., II, 136 n.

<sup>4</sup> Arthur L. Sells, *Les Sources Françaises de Goldsmith*, pp. 170-4.

<sup>5</sup> Such a comparison seems never to have been made except by Bolton Corney, *loc. cit.*, and he was interested only in the scraps of verse. By an odd mischance the quatrain he reprints (*Comic Romance* II, 161) is not Goldsmith's though it is also not Brown's; cf. *infra*, p. 176. The only verses by Goldsmith in the work are the two couplets, I, 297, that Brown had left untranslated.

<sup>6</sup> *The Whole Comical Works of Mons. Scarron . . .* translated by Mr. Tho. Brown, Mr. Savage, and others. London, 1700, 1703, 1712, 1727 (2 vols.), 1741, Dublin, 1751-2 (2 vols.), London, 1759 (2 vols.). In the two volume editions the first volume contains the *Comical Romance*. This translation (referred to hereafter as Brown's) made liberal use of an earlier translation by J. B. [John Bulteel?], London, 1676, work that seems to have been unknown to Goldsmith.

like a Man, and in *plainer* Terms; *it was betwixt five and six of the Clock, when a Cart came into the Market-Place of Mans.*<sup>7</sup>

The sun had already *performed* more than half his course, and having reached the *declivity* of the heavens, was hastening, with his usual velocity, to his nightly goal: in *plain* English, *it was betwixt five and six of the clock, when a cart drove into the market-place of Mans.*<sup>8</sup>

And, as a check, let us include the French:

Le soleil avoit achevé plus de la moitié de sa course, & son char ayant attrapé le penchant du Monde, rouloit plus vite qu'il ne vouloit. Si ses chevaux eussent voulu profiter de la pente du chemin, ils eussent achevé ce qui restoit du jour en moins d'un demi-quart-d'heure; mais au lieu de tirer de toute leur force, ils ne s'amusoient qu'à faire des courbettes, respirant un air marin qui les faisoit hennir, & les avertissoit que la mer étoit proche, où l'on dit que leur Maître se couche toutes les nuits. Pour parler plus humainement & plus intelligiblement, il étoit entre cinq & six, quand une charrette entra dans les Halles du Mans.<sup>9</sup>

Even a hasty inspection of these three versions will show a number of interesting possibilities or probabilities. Most striking is the fact that although Goldsmith has omitted a large part of the deliberate pomposity of the introduction, and departed quite freely from the earlier version, his own, after the first ten words, could have been made without any reference to the original at all. His translation thereafter is no more correct than Brown's, far less literal, and it shows no evidence of a collation of the French text. There is also positive reason for believing that he had Brown's translation actually before his eyes when he was at work: 'performed' for 'achevé', and 'declivity' for 'pente' seem inspired by Brown rather than Scarron. Still more the conclusion of the passage betrays Goldsmith's technique; Brown's words even to the added phrase 'of the clock' are reproduced with the single exception of 'drove' for 'came'.

<sup>7</sup> Brown, 7th ed., 1759, I, 1-2. This is the edition Goldsmith must have used because it alone contains certain printer's errors reproduced in Goldsmith; e.g. *Goldsmith* (I, 84) & 1759 'Bridge of So': 1700-52 'Bridge de [or of] Sé [or Se]'; *G* (I, 110) & 1759 'if am at last': 1700-52 'if I am at last'; *G* (I, 258) & 1759 'billet-deaux': 1700-52 'Billet-doux.' I have not seen 1741, but the testimony of the other editions is sufficient. Italics here and throughout are mine.

<sup>8</sup> Goldsmith I, 1.

<sup>9</sup> Scarron, *Roman Comique*, Paris, 1752, 3 vols., I, 1-2. Any of the numerous contemporary editions would do as well.

Let us continue the comparison with a short passage from the next page:

## Brown I, 2

*A young Man, as poor in Clothes as rich in Mien, walked by the Side of the Cart: He had a great Patch on his Face (which covered one of his Eyes, and half of one Cheek) and carried a long Birding-Piece on his Shoulder, wherewith he had murdered several Magpies, Jays, and Crows, . . .*

## Goldsmith I, 2

*By the side of the cart walked a young man as poor in cloaths, as rich in mein. He wore a patch on his face, of so enormous a size, that it quite eclipsed one eye, and half of one cheek; and carried on his shoulder a long fowling-piece, which had been the death of crows, jays, and magpies, without number.*

Here it is even more obvious that Goldsmith is merely revamping the old translation to save himself the trouble of making a new one.<sup>10</sup> However, let us take one more passage before drawing final conclusions. Chapter vi begins:

## Brown I, 14

*Rancour went into the Inn something more than half drunk: La Rappiniere's Maid, who introduced him, bid his Hostess get a Bed ready for him: Who have we here?*

## Goldsmith I, 33

*Rancour went into the inn, with a hearty meal on his stomach, and something more than half drunk: he was introduced by la Rappiniere's maid, who bid the hostess get a bed ready for him. Who have we here?*

It is now clear that Goldsmith worked without any reference to the French at all.<sup>11</sup> He took Brown's translation, condensed it in some places, amplified it in others, and devoted his energies toward making a smoother, more equal, more polished, more refined version; but it must be admitted that in refining he has lost something of Brown's racy vigor. Furthermore, these three typical examples show that his revision grew less and less thorough as he

<sup>10</sup> Scarron I, 2; 'Un jeune homme aussi pauvre d'habits que riche de mine, marchoit à coté de la charrette. Il avoit un grand emplâtre sur le visage qui lui couvroit un oeil & la moitié de la joue, & portoit un grand fusil sur son épaule, dont il avoit assassiné plusieurs pies, geais & corneilles, . . .'

<sup>11</sup> Scarron I, 26: 'La Rancune entra dans l'Hôtellerie, un peu plus que demi-ivre. La servante de la Rappiniere qui le conduisoit, dit à l'Hôtesse qu'on lui dressât un lit. "Voici le reste de notre écu. . . ."

went on. His virtually complete capitulation can be found at the beginning of Chapter viii:<sup>12</sup>

## Brown I, 20-1

*The strolling Company consisted of Destiny, Olive and Rancour, who had each of them a Servant, who all expected to be one Day, Actors in chief. Of those Servants, some began to speak without blushing, or being dashed out of Countenance. But among the rest, Destiny's Man acted indifferently well, understood what he said, and did not want Wit. Mrs. Star and Mrs. Cave's daughter played the principal Parts. Mrs. Cave acted the Queen, and the Mother; and sometimes Merry-Andrew's Wife in a farce. . . .*

## Goldsmith I, 47

*The strolling company consisted of Destiny, Olive, and Rancour, who had each of them a servant, who all expected to be one day, actors in chief. Of those servants, some began to speak without blushing, or being out of countenance. But among the rest, Destiny's man acted indifferently well, understood what he said, and did not want wit. Stella and Mrs. Cave's daughter, Angelica, played the principal parts. Mrs. Cave acted the queen, the mother, and sometimes harlequin's mistress in farces.*

For many succeeding chapters Goldsmith continued to reproduce the earlier translation with a mere minimum of alteration in the fashion shown in the last example. The changes, such as they were, included the following kinds: 1) a consistent revision of certain proper names, like 'Stella' for 'Star', etc.; 2) an occasional refining of what presumably seemed to him Brown's vulgarity, such as the not too happy revision in the last sentence of the passage quoted above; and 3) the occasional excision of a word or phrase, such as 'dashed', above, or a number of phrases at the end of Chapter xv. Otherwise one text is practically a word for word reproduction of the other.

Ordinarily such a process once begun would be continued to the end; yet in the present case it stops abruptly in the middle of Chapter vii<sup>13</sup> of Volume II. Page 96 is Brown-Goldsmith; page 97 is the work of a new translator.<sup>14</sup> A sentence or two will show what has happened:

<sup>12</sup> Sells, *loc. cit.*, points out the difference between the opening chapters and the later ones, but he places the point of abdication at the opening of Chapter x.

<sup>13</sup> 'The judge in her own cause'; it is misnumbered, and should be Chap. viii; in the French, it is Part II, Chap. xiv.

<sup>14</sup> The discrepancies and inconsistencies that Sells lists, *loc. cit.*, are perfectly understandable in the light of this fact.

## Brown I, 227

... and were come up to her Relief. This wonderful Action of hers, did not go without its Reward. The Emperor in Recompence, presented to the unknown Don Hernando, a Commandery of great Revenue, as likewise a Regiment of Horse, which had belonged to a Spanish Colonel, killed in the late fight.

## Goldsmith II, 96-7

... and were come up to her relief. This wonderful action of hers, did not go [without]<sup>15</sup> / its reward. The Emperor made the unknown Don Ferdinand a governour of the order of St. James, and gave him a regiment of horse belonging to a Spanish nobleman who had been killed in the last action.

With these must be compared the French:

... & de venir dégager ce vaillant Empereur. Une si belle action ne fut pas sans récompense. L'Empereur donna à l'inconnu Dom Fernand une Commanderie de Saint Jacques de grand revenu, & le Regiment de Cavalerie d'un Seigneur Espagnol qui avoit été tué au dernier combat. [II, 170.]

Certainly this translator was working from the original. And the rest of Part II, and all of Part III are done in the same way, the French being rendered directly<sup>16</sup> but freely, and without literary distinction.

At first glance the situation seems puzzling, because from a literary standpoint there was no good reason why the break should have come at the bottom of page 96, which was neither the end of a chapter nor a pause in the narrative. But from a bibliographical standpoint there is no obscurity, because page 96 is the last page of a sheet, E, and page 97 is the first page of the next sheet, F. Thus Goldsmith-Brown extends all through Vol. I, sigs. B-P, and Vol. II, sigs. B-E, while the work of the new translator comprises sigs. F-N of Vol. II.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, in the Goldsmith-Brown portion, there are one or two press numbers<sup>18</sup> on every

<sup>15</sup> 'Without' is the catchword on p. 96, but it is accidentally omitted from p. 97.

<sup>16</sup> There may be a slight contamination from Brown, especially at the beginning of this part of the work.

<sup>17</sup> There are five unsigned leaves of prefatory matter in I, and four in II; I suspect that N12, described by bibliographers as wanting in II, is actually the extra leaf in the prefatory matter containing the 'Address'. There is no sig. A in either volume.

<sup>18</sup> A press number 'is a small figure which . . . appears at the foot of a page, sometimes twice in a gathering. . . . It was the custom for [a form] to be assigned to a particular printing press, and the number of the machine to be added.' R. B. McKerrow, *Introd. to Bibl.*, 1927, p. 82.

sheet, but on these last eight sheets there are none. Now since this typographical distinction coincides exactly with the change in literary character, it can not be considered accidental,<sup>19</sup> and Griffin's previously quoted statement ('The following translation, a few sheets excepted, was executed by the late Dr. Goldsmith'), takes on a new significance; for with the bibliographical distinction established, it is possible to identify Griffin's 'few sheets' precisely as these last eight. The rest of the translation he regarded as Goldsmith's,—or at least he published as Goldsmith's.

Since it was to his advantage to publish the translation under Goldsmith's name, Griffin can be trusted implicitly when he admits that the 'few sheets' were not by Goldsmith, and they would indeed be regarded as unauthentic on literary grounds. On the other hand, there is no reason for doubting that Goldsmith was the reviser of Brown for the rest of the work, for its literary qualities bear out the publisher's attribution. But it is difficult to say if Griffin knew that most of the book he was publishing was practically a reprint of Brown's translation. Certainly he would have had no objection to Goldsmith's procedure in the first seven chapters; he might even have supplied an interleaved copy for the purpose.<sup>20</sup> But with regard to the remainder it is hard to see why he pointedly called for a comparison with Brown if he knew that such a comparison was fatal. Yet Goldsmith could have deceived him only with the collusion of the printer, for the printer's copy was a printed text, corrected, not a fresh MS.<sup>21</sup>

There the matter may be allowed to rest. What is clear is that Goldsmith, greatly occupied,<sup>22</sup> never took this task very seriously,

<sup>19</sup> The use of press numbers was erratic, but here the distinction can fairly be used as a demonstration that there was a delay between the printing of the first eighteen and the last eight sheets. The unsigned leaves were probably printed last. Some corroboration is found in the fact that watermarks are seen only on the sheets without press numbers (II, F-N and the nine unsigned leaves), indicating a different stock of paper or a different imposition of the form on the sheet.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. James Prior, *Life of Oliver Goldsmith*, 1837, 2 vols., II, 439: "Doctor Goldsmith's compliments to Mr. Cadell, and desires a set of the History of England for correction, if interleaved the better."

<sup>21</sup> The carrying over of printer's errors from the 1759 ed. of Brown shows this; cf. *supra*, p. 173, n. 8.

<sup>22</sup> In the winter of 1773-4 Goldsmith was working on his *Grecian History*, *Animated Nature*, a third *History of England*, a revision of *Polite Learn-*

slighted his work on it increasingly, ceased work altogether, and died—probably in arrears with the printer in death as he had been so frequently in life. Later Griffin hired someone to finish the translation and published the whole work under Goldsmith's name for what he could get out of it.

HAROLD STEIN

New Haven, Connecticut

### ENGLISH DRAMA TRANSFERRED TO PRÉVOST'S FICTION

The Abbé Prévost's knowledge of English literature has been studied by Professor George R. Havens, M. Paul Hazard, and other investigators.<sup>1</sup> In a later article M. Hazard, pointing out Prévost's use of a plot as old as Terence's *Andria* for an episode in the *Mémoires et Aventures d'un Homme de qualité*, concluded that "l'Abbé Prévost n'est pas remonté jusqu'à l'auteur latin, et a pris dans *The Conscious Lovers* l'aventure déjà toute anglicisée."<sup>2</sup>

An equally famous English play (with a source perhaps less accessible to Prévost),<sup>3</sup> Thomas Otway's *The Orphan: or, the Unhappy-Marriage*, was appropriated by Prévost and turned into speciously historical narrative.<sup>4</sup> The Abbé's strategy was simple. After he had changed or suppressed the names, he had the brother of the heroine (Monimia), M. de Sauvebœuf (Otway's Chamont),

*ing, Retaliation*, and the *Experimental philosophy*, as well as the *Comic Romance*: Prior, *op. cit.*, II, 487. Goldsmith's sole reason for using Brown was to save time, for his knowledge of French is beyond question. The only edition of the *Comic Romance* mentioned in the Sale Catalogue of his library is apparently in French, lot 7 of the 8vos etc., Prior, *op. cit.*, II, 583. Of course the copy of Brown used for revision would have gone to the printer and would not have been included in the sale.

<sup>1</sup> For a resuming of the material and a bibliography, see Paul Hazard et ses étudiants américains, *Études critiques sur Manon Lescaut* (University of Chicago Press, 1929).

<sup>2</sup> Paul Hazard, "Une Source anglaise de l'Abbé Prévost," *MP.*, xxvii (1930), 339-44.

<sup>3</sup> *English Adventures. By a Person of Honour* (1676). This romance is commonly attributed to Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery.

<sup>4</sup> *Œuvres choisies de Prévost. Avec Figures* (Paris, de l'imprimerie de Leblanc, 1810), III, 58-77.



tell the story of his life including in detail as much of the action of Otway's *Orphan* as the narrator could personally observe, or take part in, or conveniently have reported to him. Otway's highly emotional domestic drama is reduced to an intelligible and plausible piece of fiction with a lesson supposedly applicable to the immediate problem of Prévost's "homme de qualité."

That Prévost used Otway's play rather than its source—the *History of Brandon*<sup>5</sup> in the *English Adventures* (1676)—is evident from an analysis of the changes made by Otway in refashioning Brandon's story for the stage. Dropping out Brandon's mother, who had received an "only Daughter" as a sacred trust from a dying friend, Otway provided the heroine with a brother, and transferred the responsibility for the orphan girl from Brandon's mother to his father. In effect Otway created two new characters (both of considerable importance in Prévost's narrative): Acasto, Monimia's guardian (perhaps designed as a tribute to the first Duke of Ormond), a simple, incorruptible nobleman, living in retirement from the court; and Chamont, Monimia's brother, a fiery hero and the passionate defender of his sister's and his family's honor. Good Acasto, friend to the deceased elder Chamont, and his comrade in the wars, cherishes Chamont's children, Monimia and young Chamont, as he does his own Castalio, Polydore, and Serina. Otway's young Chamont (who does not exist in the *History of Brandon*) seems sufficiently impressive to Prévost to be chosen as the narrator of the events—a rôle which Brandon himself had filled in the *English Adventures*, telling the story of his own evil stratagem and its tragic consequences. Finally, to cite an example of Prévost's indebtedness in plot to a contribution by Otway, one can point to the use of Otway's duel scene between the ill-fated sons of Acasto. Brandon, more naïve than Otway or Prévost, trusted to clear the stage of all the characters but himself by the simple device of having them die of distress.

If there is some truth in fiction, or at least in Prévost's brand of pseudo-fiction in the *Mémoires et Avantures*, his picture of the man of quality and the young Marquis in his charge extending their

<sup>5</sup> This story from the first part of the *English Adventures* (1676) is readily accessible in appendix A of Charles F. McClumpha's *The Orphan and Venice Preserved By Thomas Otway* (Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1908), pp. 138-54.

knowledge of English drama may be not untrue to the author's own experience in England. Prévost's M. de Renoncour, if not Prévost himself, credited his love for English plays to the fascination of Mrs. Oldfield:

Elle m'a fait aimer le théâtre anglois, pour lequel j'avois d'abord fort peu de goût. Charmé du son de sa voix, de sa figure et de toute son action, je me pressai d'apprendre assez d'anglois pour l'entendre, et je ne manquai guère, après cela, d'assister aux pièces où elle paroissoit. Le marquis se rendit capable, en fort peu de temps, de goûter le même plaisir. Nous lisions la pièce qui devoit se représenter, avant que d'aller au théâtre; de sorte qu'avec la connoissance médiocre que nous avions de la langue, il ne nous échappoit presque rien de la déclamation.<sup>6</sup>

This is a pleasant picture of a slightly strenuous but satisfying effort of a Frenchman to enjoy an alien culture. In his fiction Prévost, as we have seen, turned his conscientiousness to account in appropriating for his own uses at least two English plays: Steele's *Conscious Lovers* and Otway's *Orphan*.

Since fiction was for long the poor relation of literary genres of greater reputation and dignity, "lifting" material from the theatre was probably more common than has been realized. Collecting examples from other writers of fiction to add to these two from Prévost might throw light on the whole question of the relation of the early novel to the drama.<sup>7</sup>

PAUL BUNYAN ANDERSON

*Parsons College*

---

<sup>6</sup> *Œuvres choisies de Prévost* (Paris, 1810), II, 280. On the next page he remarks: "Le Hamlet de Shakespear, le don Sébastien de Dryden, l'Orphan et la Conspiration de Venise d'Otway, plusieurs pièces de Congrewe, de Farguhar, etc., sont des tragédies admirables, où l'on trouve mille beautés réunies."

<sup>7</sup> Mrs. Delariviere Manley made a somewhat original use of another popular English domestic tragedy—Southerne's *Fatal Marriage; or, the Innocent Adultery*—by introducing the effects of seeing a performance upon each of the people in the amorous triangle with which she was dealing. She does not name "the Opera," as she chooses to call it, but sets forth the plot of Southerne's tragedy—*New Atalantis* (1720), I, 242-43.

## TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF VOLTAIRE

Francis Hastings, tenth Earl of Huntingdon (1728-1789) was, in the words of his adopted father, Lord Chesterfield, "one of the first peers of England, whose family is celebrated in the most ancient records."<sup>1</sup> He chose Bolingbroke and Chesterfield as his mentors, much to the horror of his Methodist mother. It was, no doubt, the influence of these men which interested him in the patriarch of Ferney. The following notes to him explain themselves and have no importance except as they tend to complete Voltaire's correspondence.<sup>2</sup>

## I.

a ferney 13 7-bre 1771

Mr de Voltaire présente ses très humbles respects à Monsieur le comte de huntingdon.

Malgré le triste état où il est il aura autant de plaisir que d'honneur à recevoir un homme de son nom et de son mérite. Les assujettissements que l'âge et les maladies imposent à ce pauvre solitaire ne lui permettent pas de diner, mais si Mylord veut venir souper et coucher le jour qu'il voudra, le vieillard tachera de rejeunir pour lui faire sa cour. Si ses souffrances sont trop grandes, sa nièce lui fera les honneurs de la maison dans les moments de douleurs où le malade sera incapable de lui tenir compagnie.

Durum sed levius fit patientia  
Quidquid corrigere est nefas.<sup>3</sup>

## II.

s. l. n. d.

Si Mylord huntingdon veut venir faire l'honneur au vieux malade de souper et de coucher chez lui dimanche, il lui fera un très grand plaisir. le vieux malade oubliera toutes ses souffrances.

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

*University of California at Los Angeles*

<sup>1</sup> Seymour, A. C. H., *Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon* (London, 1844), I, 115.

<sup>2</sup> We are indebted to the administrators of the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery for permission to publish these letters.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Horace, *Carmina*, I, 24, 19.

# SEITENLICHTER AUF DEN CHARAKTER GERSTÄCKERS

Briefe und Tagebücher—mit anderen Worten Persönliches aus der Feder Gerstäckers—scheinen uns nur spärlich überliefert zu sein. Was uns erhalten ist, befindet sich zum grössten Teil in Händen von Liebhabern und hat seinen Weg in die Öffentlichkeit noch nicht gefunden. Eine Arbeit, die sich zum grössten Teil auf der Korrespondenz und den Tagebüchern Gerstäckers aufbaut, ist Richárd Meynes Dissertation *Gerstäcker Frigyes élete és művei*, Sopron, 1904, die des längeren im *Euphoriön* besprochen wird.<sup>1</sup> Gemäss den Worten des Verfassers dieser Besprechung, Robert Gragger, bildet die Veröffentlichung des gesammelten Materials in dieser Arbeit "einen wertvollen Beitrag"<sup>2</sup> zum Verständnis der Persönlichkeit Gerstäckers. Erich Seyfarth in seiner Arbeit *Friedrich Gerstäcker, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des exotischen Romans in Deutschland*<sup>3</sup> erwähnt drei unveröffentlichte Briefe Gerstäckers, die sich in der Universitätsbibliothek München befinden; daneben hören wir von vorgenanntem Autor, dass zwei andere Briefe sich in der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig befinden.

Die folgenden Ausführungen sind einer Sammlung unveröffentlichter Briefe Gerstäckers an seinen Verleger H. Costenoble, Jena, entnommen.<sup>4</sup> Die Zahl der vorliegenden Briefe beträgt hundertsechsenddreissig. Dieselben stammen aus den Jahren 1861 bis 1872. Der erste Brief, am 25. September geschrieben, hat als Absendeort Rio de Janeiro, wo Gerstäcker sich am Ende seiner dritten Reise nach Amerika (1860-1861) befand. Kurz darauf bringt der französische Dampfer Guyenne den Dichter von dort nach Bordeaux, wo er am 18. Oktober 1863 eintrifft. Am 28.

<sup>1</sup> *Euphoriön*, Bd. xvi (1909), S. 324 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, S. 327.

<sup>3</sup> Inaugural-Dissertation, 1930, Jos. Waibel'sche Buchdruckerei, Freiburg im Breisgau, S. 73.

<sup>4</sup> Dieselben befinden sich im Privatbesitz des Herrn Professor Dr. W. Kurrelmeyer, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, und sind in Verbindung mit meiner Doktor-Dissertation *Gerstäcker und die Probleme seiner Zeit* (Maschinenschrift, The Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore.) kopiert und gelesen worden. Ich wünsche auch an dieser Stelle Herrn Professor Dr. Kurrelmeyer meines ergebenen Dankes zu versichern.

Oktober weilt er bereits in Rosenau bei Coburg. Von jetzt ab haben wir in den Briefen wohl die ununterbrochene Korrespondenz Gerstäckers mit seinem Verleger, da die Briefe inhaltlich zusammengehören und nur wenige Lücken aufweisen. Das Jahr 1863 bildet eine Ausnahme. Aus diesem Jahre ist nicht ein einziger Brief erhalten. Die Reise Gerstäckers mit dem Herzog von Sachsen Coburg Gotha nach Afrika im Jahre 1862 und später seine vierte Reise nach Amerika bedingen längere Unterbrechungen. Im ersteren Falle haben wir eine Unterbrechung, die vom 23. Februar 1862 bis zum 4. Juni 1862 dauert, im letzteren liegen keine Briefe vom 6. Juli 1867 bis zum 25. Juni 1868 vor. Wie schon oben erwähnt, reicht diese Korrespondenz bis ins Jahr 1872, dem Todesjahr Gerstäckers. Sein letzter hier vorliegender Brief ist ungefähr fünf Wochen vor seinem Tode geschrieben, am 22. April 1872. (Gerstäcker starb am 31. Mai 1872.)

Die Flüchtigkeit, die sich in Satzbau und Interpunktion verrät, und die den meisten Werken Gerstäckers den Stempel aufdrückt, weist auf die grosse Eile hin, in der manche von ihnen aufs Papier gebracht worden sind. Dies wird auch aus den Briefen klar, die manchmal einen Einblick in die Entstehungsgeschichte seiner Werke gestatten und uns die erstaunenswerte Eile erkennen lassen, mit der Gerstäcker ein Werk vollenden kann. Teilweise erklärt sich dies aus der inneren Unruhe, die Gerstäcker fortwährend antreibt, sich auf Reisen zu begeben. Beständig trägt er sich mit der Absicht, seinen Aufenthaltsort zu wechseln. Ausdrücke wie: "Sitze noch schauderhaft in Kisten," "Ich sitze hier in einem solchen Wirrwarr, dass ich nicht weiss, wo mir der Kopf steht," "Der Kopf wirbelt mir," "Jetzt nur alles in grösster Eile," finden sich häufig in seinen Briefen.

Alle Briefe mit Ausnahme von fünf haben ein Datum. Ausser diesen fünf liegen noch zwei andere Briefe vor, die zwar nicht von Gerstäcker, dafür aber von Costenoble, dem Empfänger, datiert sind.

Ohne den Wert der Briefe zu überschätzen, findet man sie doch in vieler Hinsicht interessant und aufschlussgebend. Sie werfen ein Licht auf den Charakter des Schreibers, auf sein Verhältnis zu seiner Gattin und zu seinem Verleger. Ist man bei anfänglicher Beschäftigung mit Gerstäckers Charakter geneigt, denselben auf Grund seines langen Aufenthaltes in unwirtlichen Gegenden frem-

der Erdteile als eine rauhe Natur zu betrachten, so fühlt man sich von dem Inhalt dieser Briefe überrascht. Der Ton ist überaus höflich und freundlich. Keine Spur von einer unpolierten Natur. Jede Ratenzahlung bestätigt er mit einem herzlichen Dank. Für längeres Schweigen bittet er um Entschuldigung. Fast in jedem Briefe bittet er, der Frau Costenoble Grüsse auszurichten. Seine gewöhnlichen Briefendungen sind: "Ihr treu ergebener," "Ihr alter getreuer," "In herzlicher Freundschaft" und "Mit herzlichen Grüssen von Haus zu Haus." Einen grossen Kontrast zu diesem höflich herzlichen Ton der Gerstäckerschen Briefe bildet der ewig nörgelnde Ton eines Dr. Gutzkow.<sup>5</sup> Selbst wo Gerstäcker in einem Paragraphen eine etwas energische Rede anschlägt, verliert eine solche Stelle ihre volle Schärfe durch Einfügungen wie "Mein lieber Herr Costenoble."

Weiter zeigt sich Gerstäckers Verhältnis zu seiner Frau als ein herzliches, was sich in Berichten über ihr Befinden ausdrückt. So schreibt er am 13. Februar 1864:

Sein Sie mir nicht böse, wenn ich alles Geschäftliche jetzt ruhen lasse. Ich habe schweres Leid in der Familie. Meine arme Frau hat eine schwere, zu frühe Niederkunft mit einem toten Kind gehabt. Sie ist sehr angegriffen. . . .

Sechs Tage später, am 19. Februar 1864:

Ich kann Ihnen wenigstens die gute Nachricht geben, dass es mit meiner Frau besser geht, und ich hoffen darf sie bald genesen zu sehen.

Wiederum am 17. März 1864:

Bei mir zu Hause geht es jetzt Gott sei Dank wieder besser, aber Sie dürfen mir glauben, mein guter Herr Costenoble, ich habe auch eine recht schwere Zeit durchgemacht, da meine Frau Monate lang von den unheimlichsten Phantasien heimgesucht wurde. Das scheint sich jetzt, wie sich der Körper kräftigte auch wieder verloren zu haben, und gestern hat sie zum ersten Mal das Theater wieder besucht.

Das Verhältnis Gerstäckers zu Costenoble ist wärmer als es oft zwischen Autor und Verleger zu sein pflegt. Costenoble ist ängstlich bemüht, alle Romane und Erzählungen Gerstäckers in seinen Verlag zu bekommen, wohl ein Beweis, dass die Werke des letzteren

<sup>5</sup> Aus *Karl Gutzkows Briefen an H. Costenoble in Jena*, Dissertation von Arthur H. Hughes, Maschinenschrift, The Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore, 1931.

einen geschäftlichen Gewinn bedeuten. Der Verdacht allein, dass ein anderer Verleger auf Werke Gerstäckers reflektiere, genügt, um ihn in Harnisch zu bringen. Andeutungen dieser Art finden wir häufig in den Briefen. So erwähnt Gerstäcker im Briefe vom 25. Juni 1864, dass ein Berliner Verleger sich grosse Mühe gegeben hätte, "etwas von mir in Verlag zu bekommen." Im darauffolgenden Briefe lesen wir dann:

Da haben wir wieder einmal den Beweis wie anders genau dieselben Worte klingen wenn man sie spricht, als wenn man sie schreibt. Wovon meine Seele nicht gedacht hat Ihnen mit einem Berliner Verleger zu drohen, das glauben Sie, und ich hatte es als Scherz und im Lachen hingeschrieben. Wenn Sie die Briefe gelesen hätten die ich dem Herrn geschrieben so hätten Sie sich 4 ingrimmige Seiten Ihres letzten Briefes ersparen können.

Er schliesst diesen Brief mit den Worten: "Nein mein guter Herr Costenoble ich denke wir Beide kennen einander doch jetzt zu lange, um wegen eines Wortes aus der Haut zu fahren." (27. Juni 1864.)

Dass Costenoble grossen Eifer für die Schriften Gerstäckers zeigt, lässt sich aus Gutzkows Briefen <sup>6</sup> an Costenoble belegen.

Ich wünsche nicht gern, dass sich die Inangriffnahme der Ausführung unserer Besprechungen länger verzögerte oder wohl gar mein Interesse unter den Gerstäckerschen Schriften leiden soll. (15. September 1872.)

Und:

Sie sind ja wie verstummt. Nur auf dem Büchermarkt sehe ich Ihre enorme Thätigkeit. Roman über Roman wird angezeigt: Gerstäckers Schriften. Von den meinen sehe ich keine Annonce. (10. November 1874.)

Wie zufrieden Gerstäcker mit dem Geschäftsmann Costenoble ist, bekundet er im Briefe vom 29. März 1864, wo es heisst:

Was die Zahlung betrifft, mein guter Herr Costenoble, so kann ich Ihnen nur sagen—und ich habe das auch schon oft gegen Andere ausgesprochen—dass ich keinen Geschäftsmann der Welt kenne, der seine Zahlungen pünktlicher und genauer leistet wie Sie. . . .

Doch Gerstäckers und Costenobles Verhältnis endet nicht mit Geschäftsangelegenheiten. Sowie Gerstäcker seinen Verleger von den

<sup>6</sup> Arthur H. Hughes, "Aus Karl Gutzkows Briefen an H. Costenoble in Jena."

Vorfällen in seiner Familie auf dem Laufenden hält, so scheint auch Costenoble von allem, was seine Familie betrifft, berichtet zu haben. Und mit welcher Herzlichkeit nimmt Gerstäcker Anteil an den Geschehnissen! Einige Beispiele mögen hierfür Beweise liefern.

Am Schlusse des Briefes vom 29. März 1864 heisst es:

Mit den herzlichsten Grüssen indessen, und dem aufrichtigen Wunsch dass Ihre arme Frau recht bald ihre Gesundheit wieder erlangt und Sie der schweren, schweren Zeit überhoben werden, ein uns liebes Wesen leiden zu sehen, und doch nicht helfen zu können, . . .

Ermutung für den um den Verlust seiner Frau trauernden Costenoble spricht aus den Zeilen des Briefes vom 4. Mai 1864:

Dass Sie sich jetzt einsam in Jena fühlen, ist ja so natürlich. Wie leer und öde kommt uns alles vor, nach einem solchen Verlust. Machen Sie aber jetzt noch keine Pläne. Dem ersten Schmerz muss seine Zeit gelassen werden; später ist der Geist wieder ruhiger und kann auf's Neue sorgen und schaffen.

Dieser Schlag muss Costenoble umso härter getroffen haben, da ihm ja Gerstäcker erst zwei Monate früher zu seiner Vermählung gratulieren konnte mit den Worten:

Nehmen Sie den herzlichsten Glückwunsch zu diesem Schritt, denn ich weiss ja, wie sehr Sie sich danach gesehnt haben, Ihre Häuslichkeit geordnet, und Ihren eigenen Herd begründet zu sehen. Gott wird ja Ihrer lieben Frau auch wieder Gesundheit schenken, dass Sie sich noch recht lange zusammen des Lebens freuen können.

Als Costenobles zweite Gattin erkrankt, lesen wir im Briefe vom 27. Januar 1867:

Recht leid hat es mir gethan zu hören, dass Ihre liebe Frau an so heftigem Husten leidet, und in dem Zustand ist es allerdings bedenklich. Ich sende Ihnen anbei ein Schächtelchen hiesiger Opium Pastillen, die ausgezeichnet gegen Husten wirken und mir und anderen schon vortreffliche Dienste geleistet haben. Fragen Sie allerdings erst den Arzt über dieselben; sie sind aber unschädlich, denn jede Pastille enthält nur 1/4 Gran Opium. Mehr als eine lassen Sie Ihre Frau aber nicht auf einmal nehmen. Solange Sie die Sorge auf dem Herzen haben, können wir natürlich nicht über Geschäfte reden—das hat Zeit.

Auf Grund eines so herzlichen Verhältnisses zwischen Gerstäcker und Costenoble ist es leicht verständlich, wenn wir oft von gegen-



seitigen Einladungen und vom Austausch von Photographien hören.

Obgleich der lange Aufenthalt in der Fremde während der Jahre seiner Abwesenheit von Deutschland Gerstäckers Natur nicht verrohen liess, so bestimmte er doch, zusammen mit der primitiven Art der Existenz dieser Jahre, seine äussere Erscheinung und Lebensweise. Eine der besten Beschreibungen der Persönlichkeit Gerstäckers, die uns von Zeitgenossen gegeben wird, ist vielleicht die von Wehl.<sup>7</sup> Hier glauben wir das getreue Abbild Gerstäckers vor uns zu haben, wie es uns aus den Werken und Briefen entgegentritt. Er schreibt:

Gerstäcker (war) durchaus Naturmensch, ein sogenannter unbeleckter Bär. Er kümmerte sich wenig um guten Ton und Mode. Ein Schlapphut von grauem Filz oder ein breiträndiger Panamastrohhat, eine Joppe und dicke Stiefel mit bauchigen Hosen darüber, bildeten seine Bekleidung. Im Umgang war er ohne Umstände, zwanglos und ziemlich amerikanisch, in der Haltung nachlässig und im Gespräch harmlos und lustig. Er gab sich keinerlei Mühe, bedeutend zu erscheinen. Er redete, wie ihm der Schnabel gewachsen war.

In dieser Verbindung liess sich eine Stelle aus seinen Briefen anführen, in der er seinem Verleger berichtet, wie er körperliches Unbehagen zu beseitigen sucht. Seine Heilmethoden entsprechen ganz seiner Naturwüchsigkeit. Im Briefe vom 19. Januar 1862 lesen wir:

Ich weiss nämlich nicht, ob ich heute noch im Stande bin es zu schreiben, denn mir ist hundeelend zu Muth. Schon seit fünf oder sechs Tagen habe ich ein catharralisches Fieber, mit dem ich nichtsdestoweniger vier Tage hintereinander in bitterer Kälte auf der Jagd war, um es abzuschütteln. Die letzte Nacht nun war es ärger als je, und ich habe heute eine Hungerkur gebraucht, die mir vielleicht besser hilft. Ich fürchte es steckt am Ende gar eine Krankheit in mir, der ich vielleicht entgegen kann, wenn ich mich auf den Füssen halte, die mich aber jedenfalls packt, sobald ich mich zu Bett lege.

Trotz all dieser Urwüchsigkeit aber, die sich in dem Charakter, in der äussern Persönlichkeit, in seinen Werken und in seinen Briefen kundtut, besitzt Gerstäcker viel Anziehendes und Bewundernswertes. Der Aufenthalt in den vielen unzivilisierten Ländern

<sup>7</sup> Zitiert von Erich Seyfarth *Friedrich Gerstäcker, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des exotischen Romans in Deutschland*, S. 14.

und Erdteilen hat ihn nicht verroht, sondern ein primitiv warmes Herz voll Mitgefühl und Verständnis für seine Mitmenschen herausgebildet.

A. J. PRAHL

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Les Acadiens Louisianais et Leur Parler.* Edited by JAY K. DITCHY. Paris: Droz, 1932. Pp. 272. Fr. 44.

The name of the author of this latest volume of the *Société de Publications Romanes et Françaises* unfortunately has been lost. He failed to sign his work and those who might have known his identity are now dead. His interesting MS. was found among the papers bequeathed to the Louisiana State Historical Museum by that ardent Acadian, the late Judge A. J. Breaux of New Orleans and has been made available for students by the patient and devoted industry of Prof. Jay K. Ditchy of Tulane University, who laboriously transcribed and prepared it for publication.

That the book did not come from the pen of Judge Breaux is absolutely certain, since its anonymous author acknowledged in the preface his debt to that jurist's encouragement. The detachment in treatment and the thoroughness of the few pages of discussion of the peculiar variants in grammar, spelling, and pronunciation that crept into the Acadian dialect, suggest that the author was a "Frenchman from France" and not an Acadian born; while his references to the Civil War and the fact that his work was completed in 1901 supply dates that make it possible that he was one of the young Frenchmen, who, after being exiled for their political opinions by Napoleon III in 1848-51, found refuge in Louisiana and became school teachers and journalists in the Parishes.

Whoever he was, this "unknown soldier" of philology has left for himself a considerable memorial in his glossary of the Acadian terms in common use which differ from standard French. Listing some three thousand words, it forms the largest collection that has yet appeared, while its "runner-up," Prof. William A. Read's *Louisiana French* contains little over thirteen hundred, but is superior in scholarship and research. Prof. Read, for instance, gives five pages to a discussion of *Maringouin* (mosquito), which in the other book is dismissed with a few lines. He also devotes half a page to defining *Caouane*, giving the Latin appellation and

the habits of the animal, pursuing its derivation to an obscure Spanish source, and bolstering his opinion by references to German philological treatises and the books of early travelers; while the Ditchy tome is content to say: "CAWANE, a fresh water turtle."

Neither, however, mentions the slang use of the word to mean a Negro's head, because of its hardness, which appears in the following lines from a Negro-French poem of Reconstruction days poking fun at a black steamboat barber who had risen to be Lieutenant-Governor of Louisiana:

Pas vini di moin cé pas vrai  
Ma foué toi ein cou balai  
Mo va cassé to gros CAOUAINE  
Aussi vrai que to non cé Antouène

Dont come & tell me it isn't so  
I'll give you a bat with a broom  
I'll break your big head  
As true as your name's Antoine.

Although the unknown author lacked Prof. Read's training as a philologist and the resources of a university library, he was a thorough observer and an accurate recorder, and his account of the simple pastoral life and customs of the Acadians, which composes the latter part of his book, is keenly interesting and most valuable to students of folklore. Among the strange superstitions he mentions is that, when an Acadian dies owning bees, his family immediately decorate each hive with streamers of black paper. They believe if this is not done the bees will swarm away within nine days—a superstition that used to be found also in New England. Other queer ideas of the Acadians are that teething is made easier for babies if alligators' teeth, bones from the head of a pig, or three or five vertebrae of a rattlesnake are strung about their necks; that, if a fire is started by a bolt of lightning, all that is necessary to put it out is to sprinkle it with a small quantity of black cow's milk. It would be interesting to try to trace some of these superstitions back to the Mediaeval beliefs of Normandy, Picardy, and Saintonge, where the ancestors of the Acadians originally came from.

Alcée Fortier has also written most interestingly of the Acadians and their dialect in his *Louisiana Studies*,<sup>1</sup> which contain some most amusing letters in the patois. His essay, however, does not compare in scope with *Les Acadiens et Leur Parler*, which has accomplished a very real service for philologists by preserving such a large part of that rapidly disappearing dialect.

It may still be heard in *La Côte des Acadiens* and *La Paroisse des Attakapas*, although English—of a kind—is fast replacing it<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> New Orleans, F. F. Hansell & Bro., 1894.

<sup>2</sup> For those interested in delving further into the Acadian picture, I suggest Kate Chopin's charming vignettes of "Cajan" life—*Bayou Folk* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1894), and *A Night in Acadie* (Chicago, Way & Williams, 1897); George W. Cable's three stories collected in *Bonaventure* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1888); Desirée Martin's

even there and today on Bayou Lafourche Valmore Babin, whose cattle have strayed, calls to his neighbor, "Hé la bas! Duradon! you see ma keow you poosh heem 'ome!"

EDWARD LAROCQUE TINKER

*New York City*

---

*Les Ecrits de langue française en Louisiane au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Essais biographiques et bibliographiques.* Par EDWARD LAROCQUE TINKER. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1932. Pp. 502.

*Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana.* By EDWARD LAROCQUE TINKER. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1933. Pp. 126.

*The Palingenesis of Craps.* By EDWARD LAROCQUE TINKER. New York: The Press of the Woolly Whale, 1933. Pp. 8.

In the first volume listed above, Mr. Tinker has, by a diligent collection of widely scattered material through a period of twelve years, achieved a comprehensive list of the writers and publications in French in Louisiana from the earliest times down to the present. This has involved tracking down books, brochures, and periodicals in families and bookshops in New Orleans and in the country districts where they were often found in garrets, sheds or stables, exposed to the ravages of time, weather, and the omnivorous termites. Titles, names, and materials not obtainable in this way were traced in various American and French libraries. The biographical and bibliographical notes represent an immense amount of library research and personal investigation among the Creole families of the state. The result is an important contribution in the form of a *catalogue raisonné* of French writers and writings in Louisiana. Most of this material is of no great literary value, but it is a mine of interesting facts for the student of French civilization in a fascinating time and place. The work constitutes Mr. Tinker's thesis for the degree of *docteur de l'université* at the Sorbonne.

---

*Les Veillées d'une Soeur ou le Destin d'un Brin de Mousse* (Nouvelle-Orléans, Imprimerie Cosmopolite, 1877) which gives a very intimate picture of their home life; and a remarkably interesting book, *Histoire des Comités de Vigilance aux Attakapas* par Alexandre Barde (Saint-Jean-Baptiste, La., Imprimerie du Meschacébé, 1861) which contains proof that certain men were beaten as cattle-rustlers and run out of the state and that others had a touch of the tar-brush. For this reason it has become very scarce, as the descendants of these people have destroyed them at every opportunity.

*The Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana* traces the history of French journalism in Louisiana from the foundation of the *Moniteur de la Louisiane*, March 3, 1794, to the present day. It is divided into two parts: the first deals with the periodicals published in New Orleans; the second with those published elsewhere in the state, 136 publications are listed for New Orleans, 104 for the rest of the state, making a total of 240 down to the year 1910, when there were two newspapers for New Orleans and three for the parishes. Many of these journals were short-lived, some persisted a long time. A well-arranged chronological table with explanatory notes enables us to follow their rise and development. Periods of prosperity were favorable to the establishment and growth of journals. Many were started when there was an influx of journalists who fled from their respective countries because of political events. Thus, at the turn of the century, journalists fleeing from the revolt of the slaves in San Domingo established no fewer than ten newspapers in New Orleans, including the first of them all, the *Moniteur de la Louisiane*. Similarly, the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and the coup d'état of 1851 sent new groups of exiled journalists from France into Louisiana, many of whom founded newspapers and magazines. The latter were devoted to literature, art, and music, for the French Opera of New Orleans was a potent force at the time. They flourished about the middle of the last century. The editors of these various publications, both magazines and newspapers, were "witty, devil-may-care and belligerent beyond belief" and "exerted a great intellectual influence." After the Civil War, they declined in importance and number and finally, with the death of *l'Abeille* in 1925 (it was founded in 1827), *la Guêpe*, founded in 1902 by J. G. de Baroncelli, remained the sole survivor. An addendum should be made to Mr. Tinker's account of the latter. It was taken over by Madame Gabrielle de Baroncelli and published exclusively in French until 1932, when it became French-English and the title was changed to *le Courrier de la Nouvelle-Orléans*. It appears every two weeks and is at present the sole French newspaper in Louisiana. The only other publication regularly appearing in French is the *Comptes-rendus* of the Athénée louisianais, founded to foster an interest in the French language and literature.

The third volume, part of which is reprinted through the courtesy of *The New York Times*, treats largely of that almost legendary figure, Bernard de Marigny de Mandeville. According to Mr. Tinker, it was he who brought the game of Hazard to New Orleans, where it became very popular with the French element. Seeing the Creoles play it, the "Yankees" called it *Johnny Crapaud's* game, which was later shortened to *crapauds* and then to *craps*. A section of a surveyor's map of New Orleans, made in 1815, artistically

reproduced on the inside covers, shows the *rue de Craps*, so named by Marigny himself when he was obliged to subdivide his plantation in the Faubourg Marigny and sell off lots to meet his debts.

JAY K. DITCHY

*Tulane University*

---

*Kate Chopin and her Creole Stories.* By DANIEL S. RANKIN. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932. Pp. x + 314.

Before the publication of this attractively printed book the material on Kate Chopin was available in less than a dozen scattered sketches and essays, no one of which exceeded three printed pages. Working from original sources, and following an excellent method, Dr. Rankin has given us the first substantial biography of a writer who deserves to be better known.

The work consists of three main parts: the first comprises a critical biography, which occupies about two-thirds of the volume; the second is given over to the text of ten of Mrs. Chopin's short stories (two from MSS.) together with a short play; and the third section contains a bibliography, a useful chronological list of Kate Chopin's writings, and an index.

In the course of the biography (pp. 85 and 121) the author glances at the vexed question as to whether or not Robert McAlpin was the original of Harriet Beecher Stowe's Simon Legree, concluding that "No hope exists for the settlement of the controversy," and then proceeding to the dubious suggestion that some of the harshness associated with McAlpin's name could have been "inspired by the more recent recollections of Dr. Chopin's cruelty." The introduction of such a suggestion without adequate discussion would seem only to muddle the question further. Another carelessly considered point is that of the indebtedness of *The Awakening* to literary influences. In this connection the author is content to believe that "Kate Chopin was an original genius . . . in touch with the tendencies of the century's ending—in music, poetry, fiction." (p. 174) The nature and extent of these influences can hardly be said to have been dealt with seriously in a brief paragraph or so. It is unsatisfactory to have these speculations raised and then summarily dismissed. Regrettable also are the numerous mechanical slips in the text.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I note the following errors in proper names: (pp. vii, 102) Brazeale for Breazeale; (p. 24) Point Coupé for Pointe Coupée; (p. 83) Baptist for Baptiste; (p. 91) Barateria for Barataria; (p. 96) *Intelligenser* for *Intelligencer*; (p. 119) V. J. D. Chopin for V. J. B. Chopin; (p. 140) Benitou's for Benitous'; (p. 157) Glaize for Glaises; (p. 185) Leonides for Leonidas; (p. 208) Paul for Paula; (pp. 279, 286) Conshotta for

Dr. Rankin has done a special service to the memory of Kate Chopin in correcting an error that had persisted even to the sketch in the recent *Dictionary of American Biography*, namely, that Mrs. Chopin wrote nothing after the disappointing reception of her last novel. The discussion on pp. 185 ff. gives definite proof to the contrary.

In addition to the material printed in Part II, many sketches, letters, reviews, and generous excerpts from longer writings are interspersed throughout the biographical section, including the interesting "Honeymoon Diary,"—a record of the author's three months abroad in 1870. Thus it is possible to find, within this single volume, much of Kate Chopin in her own words, interestingly presented by a sympathetic critic.

FREDERICK HARD

*Tulane University*

---

*English Drama, 1580-1642.* Selected and edited by C. F. TUCKER BROOKE and NATHANIEL BURTON PARADISE. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1933. Pp. viii + 1044. \$4.00.

In this anthology of Elizabethan drama Professors Brooke and Paradise reprint twenty-nine plays, beginning with Peele's *The Arraignment of Paris* and closing with Shirley's *The Cardinal*, and one masque, Jonson's *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*. It is well that a representative masque should be included; and to those who are to use the volume as a textbook it would no doubt have been pleasing had the editors seen fit to include also a representative jig as illustrative of popular taste and as contrasting to the aristocratic masque. There can, however, be no quarrel over the plays included. For the most part they are the plays which, since Dr. Neilson's collection, have been recognized properly as representative; but it is refreshing to note that, although they profess to avoid singularity, the editors have reprinted no less than six or seven excellent plays which have rarely if ever before been included in such an anthology.

Except before *The Spanish Tragedy*, where there is a facsimile of Kyd's letter "toching Marlowes montruos opinions," and before *The Beggars' Bush*, where there is reproduced the crowned head of Fletcher from the 1647 folio, the editors have presented before each play a facsimile of the title-page of one of the early quartos. To the reverse side of these facsimiles the editors confine their introductions. No biographical material is given and no aesthetic interpretation.

---

Coushatta; (p. 313) Xaxier for Xavier. The date 1893 should read 1896 (p. 158, note 1, l. 8); and on p. 84 it is stated that Dr. Chopin and Julia Benoist were married June 31, 1842.

Although it might be assumed that the texts are based primarily upon the editions represented by the title-pages reproduced, the editors do not state that such is the case. They merely state that "The texts rest upon a careful new collation of the original editions, and will be found, we believe, to possess a high degree of accuracy." It was, of course, impossible for the reviewer to collate many of the early editions. Such samples as he did collate, however, enable him to support the claim of "a high degree of accuracy."

Not content, however, with attaining accurate texts, the editors have set themselves tasks vastly more difficult. In their preface the editors promise (1) to note all variant readings "that explain the nature of corruptions in the old copies," and (2) to retain spellings "which indicate the quality of the author's pronunciation."

About the only texts available for collation by the reviewer were those in the Malone Society Reprints and the Beaumont and Fletcher folio. Accordingly, as samples he selected to collate *The Arraignment of Paris*, Act I, *The Old Wives Tale*, lines 411-742, *Friar Bacon*, scenes i-iv, *The Beggars' Bush*, Act I. Only in the first of these plays did he find that the editors had failed to note all variant readings "that explain the nature of corruptions in the old copies." In I, iii, 109, they silently correct the line "The rounde in a circle our sportance must must be." The only other silent corrections noted were in the Latin phrases in *F. B.* and *O. W. T.*

There doubtless will be no agreement as to how satisfactorily the editors have retained spellings "which indicate the quality of the author's pronunciation." Although *bin* has been retained in most cases, it has been changed to *been* in *O. W. T.*, Prologue, l. 21, and I, v, 1; and *bine* changed to *been* in I, v, 64. The *u*, which here and in *A. of P.* regularly appears in such French words as *chaunce*, *daunce*, is always omitted, although to most American readers the *u* would seem to suggest a pronunciation different from their own, while *bin* would not. Similarly in *O. W. T.*, l. 558, *trod* is substituted for *troade*, which may suggest the author's (or printer's) pronunciation, as perhaps may also *harde* (*A. of P.*, I, iii s. d.), which is changed to *heard*. It would have been easier for the editors had they chosen to reprint texts in either original or modernized spelling. The reviewer cannot help feeling that the results would have been more satisfactory, for not enough of the old is retained to contribute a flavor of antiquity, yet enough to give some readers an erroneous idea of the differences between modern and Elizabethan speech.

BALDWIN MAXWELL

University of Iowa



*Dans le Sillage du Romantisme. Charles Didier (1805-1864).* Par JOHN SELLARDS. Paris: Champion, 1933. Pp. xi + 249. Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée.

Didier is in himself a minor figure whom posterity rapidly forgot and whom it would be hard to resuscitate. Yet, because of his relations with the literary giants of his day, he is well worth his monograph, and this Mr. Sellards has produced in masterly form. I should say that he had adapted the plan of Proust if Proust had not merely applied to psychological portraiture the classic methods of scholarly research. For Sellards has left unstudied no detail, however apparently trivial, in the life of Didier or in his relations to his contemporaries. The result is,—what scholarly methods do not always bring,—a portrait so vivid as to make us forget the relative insignificance of the subject. The book does honor to its author and to the C. R. B. Educational Foundation, by whose generosity it was made possible.

Charles Didier was born in Geneva in 1805. He was the child of extra-legal love and he possessed the exuberance which occasionally accompanies the bend sinister. *Audaces fortuna iuvat* was his device. He spent the years 1827-1830 traveling on foot through Italy, learning the language so thoroughly that he always called Italian the language of his youth. He was to die in misery and by his own hand in 1864, after a life replete with disasters which were due in large measure to his own impulsive temperament. He arrived at Paris almost penniless in 1830, and remained there, except for a few years spent in travel, until his death. He succeeded rapidly in making the acquaintance of most of the men of letters and was on intimate terms with Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Sainte-Beuve, George Sand and Lamennais. Most of his friendships ended in bitter quarrels and lasting hate. The documents indicate that the wrong was not all on one side,—Lamartine alone comes unsoiled out of the wash,—but Didier was certainly of a contentious nature. In this he reminds us of his great countryman, Rousseau. He wrote his confessions in the form of a journal with daily entries so frank that portions were later destroyed by his family. This journal has been the richest source for the biography.

Mr. Sellards is convinced that circumstances prevented Didier from giving the full measure of his talent. He wrote poetry, novels, drama, accounts of his travels, and engaged nearly all his life in newspaper work. Several of his works were translated into Italian and German, one into English and one into modern Greek. His travellogs are characterized by keen observation and original views on the manners and institutions of the countries he visited. Historians today find value in some of them. He is incapable of landscape painting, although he proved all his life a very real love

for natural scenery. Intensely interested in the theatre, Didier seems to have lacked all conception of stage technique, and his dramas are the weakest part of his work. He was too much of an economist and sociologist to succeed in the novel; the characters never *come alive*, although he usually portrayed himself in his heroes. Still his most successful book was a novel, *Rome souterraine* (*Anselmo* in the English version), in which he narrates the incipient conspiracies which finally brought independence to Italy.

His judgments of his acquaintances, especially after he had quarreled with them, are not lacking in perspicacity. For instance: "Sainte-Beuve is a man without generosity, without grandeur,—a consummate egoist. I had believed him better and I am disillusioned." Didier was by no means the only one to reach this conclusion. Of George Sand in her stormy youth, he says: "The bohemian nature is always uppermost in her." Of Chateaubriand in his old age: "Old, old, very old. Yet always the same *de profundis*. Indifferent to everything except himself." Didier is even capable of seeing himself clearly; he records this conversation with one of his friends: "Left alone, we spoke of me, of my uncomplaining pride, which makes me so many enemies; of my disposition to quarrel and break all relations with friends. These things are fatal to me and make success impossible. All that has often saddened me."

Like many of his contemporaries, he might have said that his heart and his head did not belong to the same individual. By temperament an ardent romanticist, he possessed an unusual intellectual curiosity; he read widely in many languages, including the classics. Lover of many women, his one great passion was for George Sand. His own marriage ended in complete disaster. Mr. Sellards has made fascinatingly clear by the monograph that Didier's talent was far superior to his accomplishment.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE

Reed College

---

*Le Chevalier Rutledge, "Gentilhomme Anglais," 1742-1794.* Par RAYMOND LAS VERGNAS, Docteur ès Lettres. (Tome 81, Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée.) Paris: Champion, 1932. Pp. 238.

Dr. Las Vergnas' sympathetic biographical and critical study of this "génie méconnu" should make Augustus Ralli shudder over his complete omission of Rutledge<sup>1</sup> as a Shakespearean critic. At last this "Personnalité internationale" has found a well merited

<sup>1</sup> For spelling of name see p. 10.

and an acutely understanding modern interpreter. Las Vergnas' purpose is to establish the continuity of Rutledge's personality up to and beyond 1789—that is, to unite the Shakespearean critic and the politician—but the main thesis of the book is obviously that Rutledge—"Irlandaise par le sang, Français par le hasard et l'adoption"—"forme un lien spirituel entre l'Angleterre et la France" (pp. 9-10). Repeatedly this appears throughout the text,<sup>2</sup> but nowhere more prominently than in the battle against Voltaire over Shakespeare. And, sadly enough, it was this very link with England—plus the "chevalier"—that helped to kill the man in the end.

Irish Walter Rutledge, naturalized Frenchman, indolent and a little bad, married, at Dunkerque, a French girl, who gave birth to Jean Jacques, Aug. 5, 1742, and then suddenly died. From that moment the boy's troubles began.<sup>3</sup> Las Vergnas traces them, very poignantly at times, from the father's remarriage (when the boy was three), through the super-studious college career, the army experience, the brief worldly fling at the expense of his father's friend, the financial troubles with his father and stepmother, the early literary endeavors, the father-in-law's bankruptcy-complex, the wretched trickery of the notary Dehérain who robbed him of his property and then put him in jail, the varying success of his later works—the actors would not play his plays, and the critics attacked them—the treachery of the police-lieutenant Le Noir whom he trusted, the fight for the bakers which led the double-crossing Necker to imprison him for two months on a flatly false charge, the ensuing terrific pamphlet-war on Necker which ended in Rutledge's driving him from the country (Las Vergnas rises to brilliancy in this Chapter XI), the breakup of his "Les Cordeliers"—a republican club for whom he edited *Le Creuset*—to the final horrible political extinction ending in prison, sickness, and death (so obscure that even Las Vergnas himself cannot trace it). It is all a pulsating career,<sup>4</sup> a series of struggles, for the man rushed from one form of writing to another to keep himself alive and in the battle: his versatility was tremendous—"ce littéraire Protée," Las Vergnas has rightly called him (p. 175).

But there are some shadows on this picture. Here is a man who read Addison, Steele, Otway, Shakespeare, Milton, Wycherley, Congreve, Farquhar, Swift, Gay, Johnson, Reynolds, Lyttelton, Cowper, Oldham, and Goldsmith,<sup>5</sup> yet never, except in the case of Goldsmith, does Las Vergnas try to trace direct influences: <sup>6</sup> it seems

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 36-8, 40, 41, 55, 106-7, 130-1, 154-5, 161-2, 164, 175-6, 201 n, 219.

<sup>3</sup> His career might well be compared with Swift's.

<sup>4</sup> Chapters III and IV are rather dull.

<sup>5</sup> See pp. 39 ff., 139, 158, 160, 163, 165.

<sup>6</sup> Could *Le Creuset* owe any debt to Wilkes' *North Briton*?

incredible, for example, that he should mention Rutledge's papers on *Paradise Lost* (p. 165) without at once comparing their ideas with Addison's. The subtitle of this book is "Gentilhomme Anglais." Why not, then, develop it more? Indeed, one might go even further and point out that this subtitle involves an interesting thesis in itself, developed by Dr. V. B. Heltzel [see *PQ*, VIII (1929), 185, and *MP*, XXVI (128), 73-90], but never noted by Las Vergnas. Similarly the author has shown no interest in the background of such ideas as "imitation" (pp. 40, 44 n, 132), "enthusiasm" (p. 104), and "primitivism" (pp. 42, 110), though he proposes an interest elsewhere in "des idées de Rutledge" (p. 97).

This same failure to appreciate the value of a background of fundamental ideas appears in what is obviously the dominating chapter of the book, "La Bataille Shakespearienne" (Chap. VII). Nowhere in this chapter has Las Vergnas summed up fundamental ideas of Shakespearean criticism and then applied them to his series of critics. He spends the first seventeen pages developing casually Voltaire's criticism of Shakespeare, though C. M. Haines<sup>7</sup> (whom Las Vergnas has apparently never heard of) did this for him in 1925. In this development, incidentally, Las Vergnas practically ignores the *Lettres Philosophiques* (1734), completely omits the *Appel* (1761), and concentrates on the letters of July 19 and August 25, 1776. It is an inadequate survey of Voltaire's criticism, it does not sum up Voltaire's ideas as a whole, and it throws emphasis wrongly on Voltaire's fear of being discovered a plagiarist rather than on his fear of being found a wretched translator: a point on which the English attacked him viciously (Baretti was right on this, though Las Vergnas cannot stand Baretti). Even the famous August letter is found to contain a "mode plaisant!"

Rutledge does not appear here till the seventeenth page, and then receives only four pages. His main idea, which Haines recognized—i. e., that Voltaire badly mangled Shakespeare—is almost lost, but his anti-classicism is obviously very refreshing, and we should like to know more about his possibly romantic ideas on Shakespeare. Las Vergnas drops him abruptly to flay Baretti sarcastically, sneer a little at Mrs. Montagu, and laugh openly at Martin Sherlock ("cet auteur de dixième ordre"). His conclusion is that Rutledge "eut . . . le privilège de la primauté chronologique"—which is flatly specious, for Mrs. Montagu's text appeared in 1769, seven years before Rutledge's *Observations*. The present reviewer has pointed out elsewhere that Mrs. Montagu "proposed nine different arguments against Voltaire" [*SP*, XXVII (Oct., 1930), 625], but Las Vergnas will have nothing to do with

<sup>7</sup> *Shakespeare in France: Criticism, Voltaire to Victor Hugo* (Oxford Univ., 1925).

ideas as such. This whole important chapter on Shakespeare is hence inadequate and indecisive: Rutledge is utterly lost in the verbal pyrotechnics intended to explain and defend Voltaire against his Italian and English enemies.

Worse than this, Las Vergnas misquotes badly at times. He cites Baretti:<sup>8</sup>

Il ne l'a point traduit, il l'a assassiné! Le Jules César de Shakespeare plaît à tous ceux qui entendent l'anglais.

Baretti actually wrote:

Il n'a point traduit le Jules César de Shakespeare: il l'a assassiné. Le Jules César de Shakespeare plaît à tous ceux qui entendent l'Anglois [Las Vergnas prints the "o" form on pp. 108-9, 221—why not here?]

He has given a completely inaccurate statement of the precise chapter-headings of Mrs. Montagu's 1777 edition in his footnote (p. 140 n), he has made sixteen mistakes in quoting ten lines of a letter of Madame Necker to David Garrick (p. 130), but worst of all, from the *Essais Politiques* (in the edition of 1777 which he used), he has quoted<sup>9</sup> (from "pp. 202-206," really pp. 202, 205-6):

La paix . . . ne peut être réellement fondée que sur l'oubli réciproque des motifs de discorde, ouvrage des préjugés les plus faux. . . . La réunion de l'Angleterre et de la France est le seul moyen qui leur reste de partager la souveraineté sur les autres peuples. . . . En laissant se multiplier dans leur sein toutes les forces qui y pourraient éclore, si leurs haines ne se hâtaient pas de les moissonner, ella formera un frein à toute ambition étrangère: se respecter et se ménager par rapport à elles-mêmes et en imposer à toutes les autres, ne seront plus qu'une seule et même chose.

This passage actually should read:

Cette paix . . . ne peut être réellement assise et fondée que sur l'oubli réciproque de tous ces motifs de discorde, ouvrage et production des préjugés les plus faux . . . [La] réunion [de l'Angleterre et de la France] est le seul moyen qui leur reste; . . . [de] partager, pour ainsi dire, la souveraineté sur les autres peuples . . . en laissant se multiplier dans leur sein toutes les forces qui pourraient y éclore, si leurs haines ne se hâtaient de les moissonner, formera un frein à toute ambition étrangère: se respecter et se ménager par rapport à elles-mêmes et en imposer à toutes les autres, ne feront qu'une seule et même chose.

We shall not go into his rather confusing summary of the interesting *La Quinzaine Angloise à Paris ou l'art de s'y ruiner en peu de temps*, except to point out the telescoping of days three and four in p. 102 in one paragraph, of days seven and eight similarly on p. 107, and of days ten, eleven, and twelve in twelve lines on p. 108. Las Vergnas' triumphant identification of Bouillac with Rutledge himself provides perhaps a reliable source for the biographical de-

<sup>8</sup> P. 137.

<sup>9</sup> P. 155.

tails used in the chapter on "La Jeunesse de Rutledge" (Chap. I), but Bouillac, says Rutledge, "joignoit le naturel le plus heureux, et une intelligence suprême"<sup>10</sup> (which seems a rather self-satisfied remark for Rutledge to make of himself and is not noted by Las Vergnas). Nor can we accept a man whose temperament is "fougueux" or "combatif" all the way through the book<sup>11</sup> as a second Addison: "l'esprit est identique"!<sup>12</sup>

However, Las Vergnas has disposed of A. Franklin as a biographer of Rutledge;<sup>13</sup> he has made excellent use of documents in several chapters (notably, I, III, XIII); he has apparently discovered a new Goldsmith letter (p. 44); he has read everything of Rutledge's that he could find;<sup>14</sup> he has produced good scholarship on revisions, chronology, and authenticity;<sup>15</sup> he has used contemporary reviews *passim*; he has written some good criticism of his own on Rutledge (pp. 31, 43, 78, 93, 97, etc., and especially p. 218); he has added twenty-seven entries to the British Museum Catalogue list for Rutledge;<sup>16</sup> and though his bibliography<sup>17</sup> favors rather antique books and omits modern periodicals, his great sympathy for his subject has produced a distinctly interesting biography. Le Chevalier Rutledge has been found at last!

R. W. BABCOCK

College of the City of Detroit

---

*George Gissing und die Soziale Frage.* Von ANTON WEBER. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1932. Pp. 298. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Heft XX).

*W. M. Thackeray: L'Homme, le Penseur, le Romancier.* Par RAYMOND LAS VERGNAS. Paris: Champion, 1932. Pp. 410.

Here are two admirable studies of English novelists, characteristic, respectively, of German and French scholarship at their best, and such as English scholars cannot afford to neglect.

<sup>10</sup> *Premier voyage de mylord de \* \* \* à Paris*, in *Nouvelle bibliothèque universelle des romans* (Paris, 1798-1805), seconde année, tome second, p. 183. This is a terribly truncated version of the original text.

<sup>11</sup> Pp. 9, 32, 41, 66, . . . 217, 218.

<sup>12</sup> P. 160.

<sup>14</sup> Pp. 177, 178, 194 n.

<sup>13</sup> Pp. 13 n, 14 n, 99 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Pp. 87, 91-2, 92 n, 146 ff.

<sup>16</sup> The Library of Congress adds an American edition: *Lord D \* \* \**, first and second excursion to Paris, being a fortnight's ramble; together with his subsequent visit. By the Ch. R \* \* \*. Tr. from the French by Francis Levesque, sr. New York, F. Levesque, sr., 1814.

<sup>17</sup> Haines' bibliography is far more complete for Voltaire. Las Vergnas may blame his printer for a few slips: pp. 42 n, 127 ("Rimer"), 170 (line 6), 188 (last line), 191 (last line), 192 n, 214 (last word). His book certainly should contain an index.

Dr. Weber, under the direction of Professor Max Förster of Munich, has produced a solid and illuminating study of Gissing as a writer on social problems. He first sets forth, briefly but adequately, the factors in Gissing's private life and in the social, economic and philosophical thought of his day, which determined the special tone of his social picture, as well as placing him exactly in relation to his predecessors and followers in the novel of social reference. One long chapter traces through his writings chronologically his growing social pessimism and determinism. Special chapters are devoted to his satire on the middle class, to his attitude on the problems of feminism, marriage, and the family, and to questions relating to nationalism and internationalism. The longest and most important chapter of all is devoted to Gissing's changing attitude towards the fourth estate. Dr. Weber shows that Gissing, under the influence of positivistic thought, started out as an ardent exponent of social reform, a champion of humanity unjustly condemned to live under conditions that inevitably produce misery and moral degradation. The circumstances of his life put him in a position to give a picture of the lower strata more precise, intimate and sympathetic than that of any novelist before him, and his strong scientific bias, together with a nature solitary and saturnine, kept him from giving that genial and sentimental coloring to his picture that characterized his English predecessors. But he was temperamentally individualistic, fastidious, a sentimental idealist, a lover of beauty, of antiquity and the classics. And more and more, as he went on, he was repelled by the crass materialism, as he considered it, of the socialistic and reform movements of his day. He was impatient with the poor for their shiftlessness and for the vulgarity of soul which they shared with the bourgeoisie. He had no faith in democracy and parliamentary government. He did not think the proletariat capable of saving themselves. His admiration was for individuals, of whatever class, whose spirit was elevated. And he came in the end to look for leadership to the aristocracy—that is, in so far as he could look anywhere for helpful leadership in a world so ruled by inexorable laws and an age so completely subjected to the dreary vulgarity of industrialism. He is a striking example of that paradox, so frequent in English letters, of the social radical turned conservative by a perfectly normal evolution of his romantic pessimism.

Dr. Weber seems to have overlooked several posthumous volumes of short-stories by Gissing, notably *The House of Cobwebs* (1906), and two collections of tales, contributed to Chicago newspapers, by which in the winter of 1877 he kept the wolf from the door,—*Sins of the Fathers* (1924) and *Brownie* (1931).

Dr. Las Vergnas's study of Thackeray is done upon a much more comprehensive scale. He is introducing Thackeray to French readers—his is, he says, the first book on the subject in French—

and his interpretation of this many-sided, monumental figure requires that he should touch upon numerous questions relating to the personality, the subject-matter and thought, and the art of the English novelist. What most intrigues him in Thackeray is the subtlety and complexity of his mind and art, the balance of opposed tendencies resulting from his passion for truth and fairness, his intellectual scepticism, his unwillingness to pass crude and unqualified judgments in a world where truth is so relative. Thus, in Thackeray's temperament, Dr. Las Vergnas draws out with sensitive skill the contradiction between sadness and joviality, tenderness and cynicism, bitterness and Christian charity. In his social message there is the curious combination of ruthless satire and sentimental idealism. Similar paradoxes abound in Thackeray's art. His humor has its root equally in the "love" called for by Thackeray's definition and the rationality or "pure intelligence" called for by Bergson's and Cazamian's. He is a great realist by virtue of his passion for truth, and that in spite of the many limitations set by his want of the scientific spirit, his prudishness, and his reluctance to enter into the secret places of feeling. In technique, he is notably weak in construction and notably strong in draughtsmanship. He gives the illusion of truth and seriousness in spite of his tricks of plot, his moralizing, and his forced happy endings.

In his writing M. Las Vergnas sometimes falls into cliché and long-windedness, but he has in large measure the French virtues of clarity, grace and suppleness. His social outlook suggests perhaps the innocent complacency of the Victorian gentleman and—shall we say?—of the literary scholar to-day. His great virtues are psychological penetration and philosophical subtlety. He loves nice distinctions, and he makes them tell. His inspirers are such distinguished interpreters of English literature as MM. Delattre, Legouis, Cazamian, Angellier. It is a magnificent school of criticism, and M. Las Vergnas has added to the debt owed by English literature to the French mind.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

*University of Minnesota*

---

*Thomas Hardys Naturansicht in seinen Romanen.* Von FRIEDA VOGT. Hamburg: Friederichsen de Gruyter, 1932. Pp. vi + 114. M. 6. (Britannica, Heft 3.)

Frieda Vogt's thesis on Thomas Hardy is an excellent example of what has come to be the typical form for theses devoted to the literature of the eighteenth century and later. It is an assemblage of information into categories the nature or value of which are



only cursorily examined. A strictly scholarly thesis in an older field attempts to prove something, the authorship of a poem, the validity of a text, the origin of a form. However circumscribed its values, it is at least impressive as an argument. Since facts are scarce, its error tends to be an excess of clever reasoning. But in the modern field the abundance and accessibility of facts too often suffocates the reasoning process altogether. The very neatness and thoroughness of her arrangement of material makes Frieda Vogt's book the better illustration.

What she has done is first to give an account of Hardy's life, which by quotation of his own comments and those of his second wife contradicts Hedgcock's statement that characters and incidents in the novels are often autobiographical: secondly, to summarize the views of the principal writers who have sought to interpret the meaning of nature in Hardy's work; and finally, and principally, to assemble as many references as possible to nature in Hardy's novels, references which are grouped not as to meaning, but more superficially as they concern sea, sky, forest, and so on.

Now, as her second section cannot fail to show, her subject is essentially philosophical. But the philosophy of an artist is certainly deducible only from an examination of the whole body of his work. The forms in which he worked are esthetic and not philosophical categories. And when the facts of a writer's career show that he regarded his principal form as poetry, when he has left such a monument of his more fertile experience as *The Dynasts*, any philosophical interpretation which neglects the poetry can have but trifling value.

There are four possible ways in which the subject concerned might have been approached. First, one may relate the literary descriptions of nature with the actual appearance of the nature described. This Miss Vogt has done very well. She has travelled in "Wessex," and discovered that Hardy was as accurate and detailed a reporter as Thoreau or any other literary naturalist. Secondly, one may point out that the details, however accurate in themselves, are so chosen and combined as to reveal a subjective attitude in the observer, in other words, that the author is an artist rather than a scientist. This approach is concerned with the question of style, whether the metaphors and other devices are of personal origin with the author or are influenced by some literary tradition. In Hardy this approach involves the meaning of the pathetic fallacy and the stylistic influence of such writers as Wordsworth and Dickens. These are problems which Miss Vogt does not even mention save for the general comment that Hardy's descriptions occasionally verge upon the melodramatic. Thirdly, one may discuss the use made of descriptions of nature to further the plot of the

novel, that is, their relation to its form. Here, Miss Vogt, without discussing the important parallel of the unity of time in the drama, is content to show that the action in Hardy's novels generally takes place within the framework of the four seasons and is thrown into contrast or comparison with what may be called their different moods. Finally, abandoning the esthetic altogether, one may discuss the philosophical implications of the conception of nature. Miss Vogt's method does not permit her to do much with this approach. Unable through her statistical method to see that a reference may be an exception rather than an essence, she contradicts Hedgcock's belief in Hardy's pessimism by such facts as that Hardy sometimes describes little birds singing. Surely the best treatment of this subject remains that of Chew who decides that the drift towards pessimism was stopped by Hardy's eventually attaining the position of the Victorian agnostics. Obviously Miss Vogt has contributed nothing of value except the arrangement of passages of description according to subject. German readers will find her second section a good summary of work that has been done upon Hardy. But American students will return to Hedgcock and Chew.

EDWIN BERRY BURGUM

Washington Square College,  
New York University

*Les Drames religieux du milieu du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle, 1636-1650.* Par MARGARET E. PASCOE. Paris: Boivin (1932). Pp. 216.

Miss Pascoe studies a group of plays derived either from the Bible, including the Apocrypha, or from lives of saints. They are all included in Part II of my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, published some six months before her book,—her *soutenance* was held on Feb. 13, 1933—but, as she states, she made no use of it. The fact that M. Gaiffe, who directed the dissertation, did not reject it on the ground that most of its facts had already been made public does credit to his sense of justice to his student, but he might have done well to advise her to add in an appendix certain corrections that a knowledge of my book would have suggested. Certainly she should not claim, as she does (p. 70), to be the only person to have studied the *Histoire pastorale*, or (p. 125) to have been the first to point out the influence of Caussin's *Herménigilde* on the *Herménigilde* of La Calprenède. I would not, however, imply that she makes no contribution to knowledge, for her analyses are much longer than I have had space for, her quotations are different, and she makes some interesting suggestions in regard to sources that are not to be found in my book. Her

most important contributions are these: she shows that Binet was an intermediary between the Latin text of Huchaldus and *Sainte Aldégonde*; she confirms Mouffle's statement in regard to his source; she gives good reason for believing that La Serre may have used a Latin MS., published only in 1917, as the source of his *Thomas Morus*; and she gives the ending to Olivier's *Herménigilde* and a more satisfactory comparison of it with its source than I was able to do, as the copy I utilized was incomplete.

Her work shows industry and pertinacity, but she is hampered by not having a wider knowledge of dramatic literature and she shows certain errors in method and some unfortunate inaccuracies in detail. Her pathetic confidence in a totally unreliable MS. repertory of plays that exists at the Arsenal makes her give dates about which no real evidence exists. She fails to distinguish clearly between the ten amateur and the thirteen professional plays she discusses. For the first group the date 1636-50 is of no importance, for such works were written throughout the seventeenth century. Moreover, she fails to include all of those in her period that were easily accessible, apparently because their titles did not reveal the nature of their subjects. Thus she omits Donnet's *Triomphe des Bergers*, a Nativity play published in 1646, and Picou's *Déluge universel*, derived from Genesis and published in 1643. The *Sage visionnaire*, published in 1647, though not taken from the Bible or the life of a saint, is more religious than some she treats and should have been included. As for the professional group, plays by Corneille, Rotrou, Du Ryer, etc. can be better understood when studied in connection with secular professional plays than with the pious contributions of their obscure contemporaries. Miss Pascoe should have pointed out the first tendencies among professional dramatists to include Biblical or Christian subjects in their plays. Such tendencies are found in the inner play of Baro's *Célinde*, in Grenaille's *Innocent malheureux*, and in Mairêt's *Athénaïs*, none of which she mentions in this connection, though it is only after these partial utilizations of religious themes that we find the fully fledged religious plays.

Miss Pascoe attempts to explain why so many religious plays appeared on the French stage at this time and why none was written by a professional dramatist of the succeeding generation, but her arguments would exclude religious plays from performance at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth, although we know that such tragedies were then played at the Comédie Française as Boyer's *Judith*, Genest's *Joseph*, Campistron's *Adrien*, and Nadal's *Saül*. The group of plays by professional dramatists that she studies should have been enlarged to include the *Indégonde* of Montauban and the *Agathonphile* of Françoise Pascal, which appeared soon after 1650. Miss Pascoe

confuses names. The quotation on p. 41 is not from *Saül*, but from *Esther*. On p. 54 she attributes to Lanson a quotation from Faguet. On p. 186 she writes "la *Mariane* de Tristan" instead of "le *Cid* de Corneille." On p. 50 she attributes to me an argument that I have not only never used, but which I combated in my edition of *Saül*, the first performance of which I date, not, as Miss Pascoe declares, on account of a statement in the preface to the play, but from the date of publication of this tragedy and from the dates of the author's other plays. There are other errors of various kinds:

P. 18. What is the evidence that *la Céciliade* was played at the Hôtel de Bourgogne? P. 55. She takes issue with Miss Thiel and myself in regard to our interpretation of *Saül*, but she seems to miss the point of our argument, for no one would deny that Saul was originally given the power to choose, but the fact is that the decision is made before the play begins, so that he is presented as condemned from the beginning of the action, whereas Corneille's heroes make their choice during the progress of the tragedy; he is consequently not a Cornelian type of hero. P. 55. There is no violation in *Saül* of the unity of place as conceived by most dramatists in 1640; the concept of reduction to a single room was only beginning to be adopted. P. 56. Fournier's remarks about the success of the play have no value. P. 66. The list of editions of Chevallard's play is incomplete. Pp. 84-85. *Epigramme* is twice given as if it were masculine, a seventeenth, but not a twentieth century usage. P. 90. As, even in the seventeenth century, November had only thirty days, the statement that the "privilege est du 31 novembre" cannot be correct; read Nov. 23. Pp. 98-9. The evidence that Mansini was used is unconvincing, for the miracle had already been found in Bello's play and the other point made by Miss Pascoe is without significance. P. 101. The last verse quoted is faulty; for scait read scavent. P. 107. La Serre was born in 1593-4, not "vers 1600." P. 112. The *Comte d'Essex* did not appear in 1632. Pp. 112-3, 141. I have shown that Lacroix's suggestion is, like many of his, unsupported by facts; also that there is no evidence that Mme de Saint-Balmon wrote *la Fille généreuse*. P. 133, n. 3. There is no evidence that *Artawerce* was played at the Hôtel de Bourgogne in 1645. P. 153. Floridor was most probably not playing at that theater when *Saint Genest* was given there. P. 155. There is more evidence of Desfontaines's influence on Rotrou's play than she gives. P. 174, l. 14. Read scabreux. P. 189, l. 20. For 1643 read 1634.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

*Le Roman français au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle, de l'Astrée au Grand Cyrus.*

Par MAURICE MAGENDIE. Paris: Droz, 1932. Pp. 459.

*Le Roman français de 1660 à 1680.* Par DOROTHY FRANCES

DALLAS. Paris: Gamber, 1932. Pp. 291.

M. Magendie has undertaken to treat almost all the French novels that appeared between 1620 and 1650, leaving aside the *Astrée*, to which he had devoted an earlier work, *le Grand Cyrus*,

which falls into the next period, and those realistic novels already discussed by M. Reynier. He has read enormously and gives information of varied character, drawn directly from the novels themselves, not from the opinions of others. He discusses the background of this massive body of literature, indicates the conception of the novel held by certain critical writers and by certain novelists, and characterizes various types of novels, pastoral, chivalric, epic, allegorical, realistic, psychological, and didactic. He also concerns himself with the influence of these novels and devotes a chapter to their structure and style. There can be no question that he has labored patiently and that his work is the most exhaustive that has been written on the French novel of the seventeenth century. Unfortunately he seems to have been infected by the ideas of composition held by many of the authors he studies, so that he presents his material in as unpalatable a fashion as if he were the reverend Bishop of Belley himself. The reader is given no index or properly prepared list of novels studied. If one reads the book, one will get a general and in the main a correct idea of the types of novel discussed, but one will have to make one's own index before being able to obtain substantial information about any special work. Another decided fault with the book is the author's almost complete indifference to the investigations of other scholars. With the exception of M. Reynier almost none of his contemporaries is alluded to, although books and articles have appeared within our memories that would have helped M. Magendie.

Pp. 47, 70, 82, the suggestions of Shakespearean influence appear to me untenable. P. 64. Lancelot's *Infidèle Confidente*, the source of a play of the same name by Pichou, is a translation of a Spanish tale by Céspedes y Meneses, as Mr. R. D. Williams pointed out to me (cf. my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, Part II, p. 803). P. 73. How could La Croix du Maine and du Verdier, both of whom died before 1608, believe that Montreux died in that year? P. 85. Why should the author of *Ibrahim* have used an obscure play by Mainfray rather than his well-known source, Yver's *Printemps*? Pp. 407-8. *Blanche de Bourbon* comes from historical sources rather than from *Polexandre*, for the non-historical resemblances between the play and the novel could easily have arisen independently; it is true that the *Sémiramis* of Desfontaines is derived from *Prazimène*, but the same statement should not be made of Gilbert's *Sémiramis*; Montauban's *Zénobie* has nothing in common with Segrais's *Bérénice* that is not in Tacitus. To the plays derived mainly or partly from the novels studied by M. Magendie may be added the following: Desfontaines, *Eurimédon*, *Orphise*, Mairêt, *Illustre Corsaire*, Tristan, *Mort de Sénèque* (*Ariane*), the anonymous *Juste Vengeance* (*Polexandre*), Chappuzeau, *Armetzar* (*Ladice*), d'Ouville, *Jodelet Astrologue* and T. Corneille, *le Feint Astrologue* (*Ibrahim*).

Dr. Dallas's Paris dissertation covers a much smaller field than M. Magendie's work and is much less erudite, but it has the advantage of being readable and easily consulted. It may be regarded as a useful introduction to the study of the French novel from

1660 to 1680. The author does not attempt to be complete, but she has read a great many novels and shorter forms of fiction and she gives a clear account of their general nature. While she recognizes the persistence of other characteristics, more conspicuous in the preceding years, she emphasizes especially the tendency in the period studied towards the short, analytical novel that prepares the way for the *Princesse de Clèves*. Her work is accompanied by an ample bibliography, in which nearly 300 works of fiction are listed, and by an extensive index. It is unfortunate that the proof was not read with greater care, for, while over fifty misprints have been corrected in a list of *errata* accompanying the book, a good many others, besides several slips of the pen, have remained unnoticed:

Pp. 15-6, 21, 31, 54, 250. *Ibrahim*, the novel, is ascribed, as it is by Magendie, to Georges de Scudéry, though there is no more evidence that he wrote it than that he was the author of the *Grand Cyrus*, which she very properly attributes to his sister. Perhaps she was misled by the existence of the play, *Ibrahim*, which Georges derived from his sister's novel. Pp. 96, 287. An unwary reader would suppose that Sidney's *Arcadia* was written by the comtesse de Pembroke. Pp. 106-7, 109. She insists on writing the *Carte du Tendre* for the *Carte de Tendre*. P. 113. The *Princesse Alcidiene* is usually ascribed, not to La Calprenède, but to his wife. P. 130, ll. 25-6. *Read* eût . . . eût. P. 149, l. 11. *Read* non. P. 160, l. 18, and index. *Read* Peyresc. P. 168, l. 11. *Read* couronnement. P. 171, note 1. *Read* Tragi-. P. 181, l. 16. *Read* donné pour. P. 184, l. 1. *Read* inquiéteront. P. 186, l. 22. *Read* agréable. P. 192, l. 23. *Read* reconnaissance. P. 194, l. 13. *Read* Elzévirienne. P. 224, note 1. *Read* (1). P. 235, note. *Read* 1682. P. 248. For BRIDON read BRIDOU.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*Beowulf*, a paraphrase by HARRY MORGAN AYRES. The Bayard Press, Williamsport, Penna., 1933. Pp. 97. The author tells us (p. 9), "I have proceeded much as an Icelandic sagaman might have done, weaving together whatever I could find that seemed to belong to the story in hand." The result is a delightful prose work by an American sagaman, based indeed on the OE poem but making use also of various Scandinavian sources and eminently worth reading for its own sake. The reviewer feels that Mr. Ayres has made a notable contribution to English literature.

K. M.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Brøndum-Nielsen, Johs. (editor).—*Acta Philologica Scandinavica: Lidsskrift for Nordisk Sprog forskning. Copenhagen: Levin & Mundsgaard, 1933. Pp. 193-274 + 4. 16 Kr. (Vol. III, No. 3.)*

Brown, Huntington.—*Rabelais in English Literature. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xvi + 254. \$2.00.*

Callaway, Morgan.—*The Consecutive Subjunctive in Old English. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1933. Pp. viii + 110. \$1.50. (Modern Language Association of America Monograph Series, IV.)*

Chambers, E. K.—*The English Folk-Play. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 248. \$3.75.*

Day, Cyrus Laurence (editor).—*The Songs of Thomas D'Urfey. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. x + 168. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in English, IX.)*

Funke, Otto.—*Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert. Bern: A. Francke, 1934. Pp. 162. M. 6.80. (Neujahrsblatt der literarischen Gesellschaft Bern, Volume XI.)*

Gordon, Dudley Chadwick; King, Vernon Rupert (eds.).—*College Readings on Today and Its Problems. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. x + 646. \$1.95.*

Harper, Gordon Huntington.—*Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F.R.S.: A Correspondence. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. xii + 222. \$2.00.*

Hoffmann-Hirtz, Marie.—*Une Chronique Anglo-Saxonne traduite d'après le manuscrit 173 de Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Strasbourg: Librairie Universitaire d'Alsace. Pp. 174.*

Holthausen, F.—*Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934. Pp. xxviii + 401-428. M. 2.50.*

Johnson, Francis R.—*A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser printed before 1700. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. xiv + 62. \$2.75. (A publication of the Tudor and Stuart Club.)*

Judge, Cyril Bathurst.—*Elizabethan Book-Pirates. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. xiv + 148. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in English, VIII.)*

Judson, Alexander Corbin.—*Spenser in Southern Ireland. Bloomington, Indiana: Principia Press, 1933. Pp. 60.*

Lathrop, Henry Burrowes.—*Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton*

*sity of Wisconsin, 1933. Pp. 350. \$2.00. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 35.)*

Mossé, Fernand.—*La Saga de Grettir, traduit de l'Islandais avec une Introduction et des Notes. Paris: Editions Montaigne (F. Aubier, editor), 1933. Pp. lxxvi + 264 + 8. (Collection du Textes rare ou inédits.)*

Olivero, Federico.—*Beowulf. Torino: Edizioni dell'Erma, 1934. Pp. cxliv + 258. L. 30.*

Schücking, Levin L.—*Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik in Beowulfepos. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1933. Pp. iv + 46. M. 3. (Volume XLII, Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.)*

Serjeantson, Mary (ed.).—*Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, Volume XIII. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1933. Pp. x + 274. 7/6.*

Tiegs, Alexander.—*Zur Zusammenarbeit englischer Berufsdramatiker unmittelbar vor, neben und nach Shakespeare. Breslau: Trewandt & Granler, 1933. Pp. viii + 144. M. 2.50.*

## GERMAN

Bartels, Adolf.—*Hebbel und Shakespeare. Johannes Krumm.—Friedrich Hebbel, ein nordischer Dichter (Vorträge). [Jahresgabe der Hebbelgemeinde. 1932]. Heide: Heider Anzeiger [1933]. 60 pp. M. 1.50.*

Beheim-Schwarzbach, Eberhard.—*Dramenformen des Barocks. Die Funktion von Rollen, Reyen und Bühne bei Joh. Chr. Hallmann (1640-1704). Diss. Jena: 1933. 33 pp.*

Beissner, Friedrich.—*Hölderlins Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1933. 194 pp. M. 7.50.*

Bergmann, Alfred.—*Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Zeugnisse für den Lebensgang und Charakter Christian Dietrich Grabbes. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung. [Germanische Studien, H. 137]. Berlin: Ebering, 1933. 616 pp. M. 22.*

Bertallot, Hans-Werner.—*Hölderlin-Nierzsche. Untersuchungen zum hymn. Stil in Prosa und Vers. [Germanische Studien, H. 141]. Berlin: Ebering, 1933. 111 pp. M. 4.40.*

Bock, Karl N.—*Niederdeutsch auf dänischem Substrat. Studien zur Dialektgeographie Südostschleswigs. [= Deutsche Dialektgeographie, H. 34 and: Universitäts-Jubiläets danske Samfund. Nr. 299]. Marburg: Elwert, 1933. xiii, 351 pp. 4°. M. 16.*

Cysarz, Herbert.—*Schiller. Halle: Niemeyer, 1934. 462 pp. M. 10.*

Dreyer, Ernst Adolf.—*Hans Friedrich Blunck. Sicht des Werkes. Leipzig: Weibe-*

Fiedler, H. G., and de Beer, G. R.—A German Reader for Biology Students. Passages from recent German scientific publications. With a Vocabulary by Herma E. Fiedler. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933. 92 pp. \$1.50.

Frings, Th.—Eduard Sievers. Elisabeth Karg-Gasterstädt — Schriftenverzeichnis. [Berichte über die Verhandlungen d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig. Philol.-hist. Kl. Bd. 85. 1933, H. 1]. *Leipzig*: Hirzel, 1933. 92 pp. M. 3.

Groeper, Richard.—Neue Beiträge zu Heinrich von Kleist. [Schriften der Kleist-Ges. Bd. 15]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1933. 23 pp. M. 4.

Heintze, Albert.—Die deutschen Familiennamen, geschichtlich, geographisch, sprachlich. 7., sehr verb. u. verm. Aufl., hrsg. von Paul Cascorbi. *Halle*: Waisenhaus, 1933. xii, 536 pp. M. 12.80.

Herg, E.—Deutsche Sprichwörter im Spiegel fremder Sprachen unter Berücksichtigung des Englischen, Französischen, Italienischen, Lateinischen und Spanischen. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1933. 130 pp. M. 5.

Hoffmann, Hellmut.—Die Metaphern in Predigten und Schriften Abrahams a Sancta Clara. Diss. Köln. *Düsseldorf*: Express-Druckerei, 1933. xix, 102 pp.

Keferstein, Georg.—Bürgertum und Bürgerlichkeit bei Goethe. [Literatur und Leben. Bd. 1]. *Weimar*: Böhlau, 1933. xii, 286 pp. M. 8.

Keyserling, E. von.—Dumala. Roman. Ed. with Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary by Theodore B. Hewitt. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1934. xii, 168 pp. \$1.35.

Klemm, Günther.—Die Liebeslyrik Christian Morgensterns und ihre Bedeutung. Diss. *Bonn*: 1933. 73 pp.

Gluckhohn, Paul.—Die Gegensätze in der Dichtung der Gegenwart und ihre geistesgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen [Vortrag]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1933. 32 pp. M. 1.35.

Kommerell, Max.—Jean Paul. *Frankfurt*: Klostermann, 1933. 419 pp. M. 16.50.

Kroesch, Samuel.—German Songs old and new. *New York*: Holt [1933]. viii, 129 pp. \$1.00.

Krogmann, Willy.—Goethes "Urfaust." [Germanische Studien. H. 143]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 163 pp. M. 6.60.

Kühn, Alfred.—Goethe und die Naturforschung. Vortrag. [Sonderdrucke aus den Nachrichten von der Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Geschäftliche Mitteilungen 1932/33. Fachgruppe 6, Nr. 8]. *Berlin*: Weidmann [1933]. Pp. 47-69. M. 1.

Langheinrich, Leonard.—Frank Thiess. Bild eines deutschen Dichters. *Berlin*: Zsolnay, 1933. 126 pp. M. 2.

weiger Trojanerkriegs. [Palaestra, 187]. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1933. xv, 248 pp. M. 17.

Lemaire, Hermann.—Das Stadt-Land-Problem und seine Gestaltung im deutschen Roman des 19. u. 20. Jhs. *Düsseldorf*: G. H. Nolte, 1933. iii, 43 pp. M. 2.80.

Lessiak, Primus.—Beiträge zur Geschichte des deutschen Konsonantismus. Mit einem Vorwort und einem Wort- und Sachverzeichnis von Ernst Schwarz. [Schriften d. philos. Fakultät der deutschen Univ. in Prag. Bd. 14]. *Brünn*: Rohrer, 1933. xvi, 303 pp. M. 13.

Lincke, Werner.—Das Stiefmuttermotiv im Märchen der germanischen Völker. [Germanische Studien. H. 142]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 172 pp. M. 6.80.

Matthison, Friedrich von.—Katalog seines Nachlasses in der Landesbibliothek. *Dessau*: 1932. 70 pp. 4°, typewritten.

May, F. E.—Deutsches Sprachgewissen. Ein Buch der Stilkunst. *Leipzig*: Grunow & Co. [1933]. 256 pp. M. 2.80.

Milch, Werner.—Arno Holz. Theoretiker, Kämpfer, Dichter. *Berlin*: Goldstein, 1933. 80 pp.

Miller, Otto.—Der Individualismus als Schicksal. [= Mumbauer, Die deutsche Dichtung der neuesten Zeit, Bd. 2, Tl. 1]. *Freiburg*: Herder, 1933. vii, 319 pp. M. 6.20.

Morwitz, Ernst.—Die Dichtung Stefan Georges. *Berlin*: Bondi, 1934. 180 pp. M. 4.

Naumann, Hans.—Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart (1885-1933). 6., neubearb. Aufl. [Epochen der deutschen Literatur. Bd. 6]. *Stuttgart*: Metzler, 1933. 403 pp. M. 5.

Prokosch, E.—An Outline of German Historical Grammar. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933. vi, 127 pp. \$1.50.

Schneider, Ferd. Jos.—Christian Dietrich Grabbe. Persönlichkeit und Werk. *München*: C. H. Beck, 1934. vi, 376 pp. M. 10.

Schütze, Georg.—Das Naturgefühl um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts in der Lyrik von Pyra bis Claudius. Diss. *Leipzig*: Frommhold & Wendler, 1933. 169 typewritten pp. M. 3.

Strauss, Wolfgang.—Der Sprachschatz niederdeutscher Kirchenurkunden Pommerns im 16. Jh. [Blätter f. Kirchengeschichte Pommerns, H. 11]. Diss. Greifswald. *Stettin*: Fischer & Schmidt, 1933. 109 pp. M. 2.75.

Stroebe, Lilian L., and Hofrichter, Ruth J.—Leicht und Neu. Vier Erzählungen für Anfänger: Fritz; Das Klavier; Alle Fünf; Pfarrer Bopfinger. Ed. with Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & C., 1934. viii, 220 pp. \$1.35.

Treder, Dorothea.—Die Musikinstrumente in den höfischen Epen der Blütezeit. Diss.



Vogt, Friedrich, u. Koch, Max.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 5. Aufl. neubearb. u. erw. von Willi Koch. Bd. 1: Von den Anfängen bis zum 17. Jh. von Friedr. Vogt†. Die Literatur im Zeitalter d. Barock. Von Willi Koch. *Leipzig*: Bibliogr. Inst. 1934. xii, 427 pp. M. 9.50.

Vos, B. J.—A First German Reader. *New York*: Holt [1933]. vi, 196, li pp. \$1.36.

Weiss, Adelaide Marie.—Merlin in German Literature. A Study of the Merlin Legend in German Literature from Medieval Beginnings to the end of Romanticism. Diss. [Catholic Univ. of America Studies in German. Vol. III]. *Washington, D. C.*: 1933. x, 152 pp.

Wieber, Friedkarl.—Der deutsche Zeitungsroman im 20. Jh. Eine volkskundliche Auseinandersetzung. *Halle*: Niemeyer [1933]. 135 pp. M. 3.60.

Wilhelm, Richard.—Friedrich Justus Riedel und die Ästhetik der Aufklärung [Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgesch. H. 23]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. viii, 137 pp. M. 5.50.

Zatočil, Leopold.—Zur gotischen Syntax. Quiman in und Verwandtes. *Mähr.-Neustadt*: Franz Meier, 1933. 15 pp.

Zinser, Richard.—Die Mundart des Oberen Gäus südlich von Herrenberg nach Lauten und Flexion. Diss. Tübingen. *Stuttgart*: Fink, 1933. v, 41 pp.

## FRENCH

Arbelet, P.—Stendhal épicière ou les Infortunes de Mélanie. *Paris*: Plon, Nourrit (1933). 255 pp. Fr. 6.

Barrière, P.—A. de Vigny, essai d'interprétation. *Paris*: Figuière. 305 pp. Fr. 15.

Bérinus, roman en prose du XIV<sup>e</sup> s., éd. R. Bossuat. 2 vols. *Paris*: Soc. des anciens textes fr., 1931. lvi + 432 + 255 pp.

Boschot, A.—Th. Gautier. *Paris*: Desclée, de Brouwer, 1933. 361 pp.

Brauns, Walter.—Die Lyrik Henry Murgers. Diss. *Jena*: 1932. vi + 90 pp.

Carmody, F. J.—Le Répertoire de l'opéra-comique en vaudeville de 1708 à 1764. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1933. 72 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. XVI, no. 4.)

Catalogue général des livres impr. de la Bibl. nationale. T. 121. Muau-Murr. *Paris*: Impr. nat., 1933. 564 pp.

Chanson de Roland, la.—Reproduction phototypique du MS. Digby 23 de la Bodleian d'Oxford, éd. A. de Laborde et Ch. Samaran. *Paris*: Soc. des anciens textes fr., 1933. 60 + 145 pp.

Clarke, S. H.—The Works of Vigny judged by his contemporaries. Diss. *Toulouse*: 1932. x + 184 pp.

les poèmes en prose de M. de Guérin. Thèse comp. *Toulouse*: Eds. de l'Archer, 1932.

Dumas.—Henri III et sa Cour, éd. Ch.-M. Des Granges. *Paris*: Hatier, 1933. 96 pp.

Dvorak, Robert.—Das Ethische und das Ästhetische bei Romain Rolland. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. viii + 71 pp.

Eker, J.—Recherches sur la syntaxe de la "Chanson de la croisade." Diss. *Toulouse*: 1932. 139 pp.

Faure, Cl.—Lettres inédites du Cardinal Le Camus. Diss. *Grenoble*: 1932. 392 pp.

Fox, Marjorie B.—La Mort le Roi Artus. Diss. *Paris*: Boccard, 1933. viii + 261 pp.

Gastinel, P.—Le Romantisme de Musset. Diss. *Paris*: 1933. 701 pp.

—Les Deux "André del Sarto" de Musset. Diss. *Ibid.*, 1933. 193 pp.

Genest, E.—Où est-ce donc? dictionnaire des phrases, vers et mots célèbres employés dans le langage conrant. *Paris*: F. Nathan, 1933. 276 pp.

Gordon, Zina.—Labiche et son œuvre. Diss. *Toulouse*: 1932. viii + 152 pp.

Guiart, J.—Hist. de la poésie à Bourg-en-Bresse. *Paris*: Baillière, 1933. 59 pp.

Itutowicz, S.—Le Peuple dans le théâtre de Molière. Diss. *Toulouse*: 1932. 123 pp.

Hainlein, G.—Die vorromantischen Angriffe in Frankreich auf die klassische Tragödie. Diss. *Jena*: 1932. 125 pp.

Hatem, Anouar.—Les Poèmes épiques des Croisades. Essai sur l'activité litt. dans les colonies francaes de Syrie au Moyen Age. Diss. *Paris*: Geuthner, 1932. xiv + 425 pp.

Helmke, Bruno.—André Suarès als Denker und Künstler. Diss. *Jena*: 1933. 82 pp.

Levallois, H.—Catalogue général des ouvrages de Molière conservés au dép. des imprimés et dans les bibl. Mazarine, Sainte-Geneviève, de l'Arsenal et de l'Univ. de Paris. *Paris*: Impr. nat., 1933. viii + 176 pp.

Matthew, J.—Amiel et la solitude. Diss. *Clermont*: 1932. 158 pp.

Méjécaze, F.—Essai de Synthèse des idées et des jugements littéraires de F. Ozanam. *Paris*: Vitte, 1932.

Micks, Wilson.—La Renaissance méridionale en Limousin. Diss. *Toulouse*: 1932. 250 pp.

Moraud, M.—La Fr. de la Restauration d'après les visiteurs anglais. Thèse comp. *Paris*: Champion, 1932. 199 pp.

Plattard, J.—Montaigne et son temps. *Paris*: Boivin, 1933. 300 pp.

Pommier, Jean.—La jeunesse cléricale d'E. Renan. Diss. *Strasbourg*: 1933. 712 pp.

—E. Renan. Travaux de jeunesse, 1843-44. Diss. *Ibid.*, 1931. xv + 271 pp.

Prill, Vera.—Caroline de la Motte Fouqué.

Rauch, Erich.—Zum Freundschaftsproblem im Leben und Werk A. Gides. Diss. *Jena*: 1933. 51 pp.

Rech, Bruno.—Grundbegriffe und Wertbegriffe bei Michel de Montaigne. Diss. *Berlin*: 1931. 56 pp.

Rickey, H. W.—Musset Shakespearien. Diss. *Bordeaux*: 1932. 193 pp.

Rutebeuf.—Le Miracle de Théophile, transposition de G. Cohen. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1934. 64 pp.

Schellenberg, G.—Bemerkungen zum Trait des Walter von Bibbesworth. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 70 pp.

Schoumacker, L.—Erckmann-Chatrian. Diss. *Strasbourg*: 1933. 409 pp.

—Un inédit d'Emile Erckmann. Diss. *Ibid.*, 1933. 93 pp.

Schreiber, Lotte.—Leben und Denken im Werk von A. Gide. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 45 pp.

Scribner, H. M.—Pierre Loti vu à travers son œuvre. Diss. *Poitiers*: 1932. 194 pp.

Semiontek, H.—L'Enfant et la litt. enfantine contemp. en Fr. Diss. *Toulouse*: 1932. 146 pp.

Souza, Sybil de.—L'Influence de Ruskin sur Proust. Diss. *Montpellier*: 1932. 158 pp.

Tipping, W. M.—Jean Regnaud de Segrais. Diss. *Paris*: 1933. 263 pp.

Trahard, P.—Les maîtres de la sensibilité fr. au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. (1715-89). T. IV. *Paris*: Boivin, 1933. 357 pp.

Tuong, N. M.—Essai sur la valeur dramatique d'A. de Musset. Diss. *Montpellier*: 1932. 457 pp.

—L'Annan dans la litt. fr. Jules Boissière (1863-97). Diss. *Ibid.*, 1932. 227 pp.

Vadasz, Elvira.—Studien zu Rivarol. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 47 pp.

Van Vree, Th. J.—Les Pamphlets et libelles littéraires contre Molière. Diss. *Paris*: (1933). 293 pp.

Zapf, Hasso.—Syntaktische Eigentümlichkeiten in den Werken Edouard Escaunié's. Diss. *Jena*: 1933. viii + 47 pp.

### ITALIAN

Agnelli, G., e Ravagnani, G.—Annali delle edizioni ariostee. Con CXIV tavole fuori testo. Pubblicati sotto il patrocinio della Reale Accademia d'Italia e del Comitato ferrarese per le onoranze al poeta. Volume primo e secondo. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1933. 2 vols., xxii + 301, 396 pp. L. 150.

Allodoli, E., e Trompeo, P. P.—Pagine classiche. Manuale di letteratura italiana per le scuole medie superiori, a cura di —. Volume II: Da Ludovico Ariosto a Giambattista Vico. Volume III: Dall'Arcadia ai

Paravia e C., 1933. 2 vols., iv + 539, iv + 438 pp. L. 23, 20.

Belotti, B.—Pietro Ruggeri, poeta bergamasco. *Bergamo*: I quaderni di "Il pensiero," 1933. 164 pp. L. 15.

Bonfigli, L.—Pagine sparse, precedute da cenni e ricordi dei professori E. Carrara, A. Donati, L. Falchi, I. Sanesi. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1933. liii + 280 pp.

Bracciolini, Poggio.—Facezie. *Milano*: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1933. 230 pp. L. 5.

Cuoco, Vincenzo.—Platone in Italia. Traduzione dal greco con introduzione e note di G. Saitta. Volume II. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1933. 357 pp. L. 12. (Collana di testi filosofici e pedagogici, no. 14.)

D'Alessandro, A.—La dottrina cattolica nella Divina Commedia. Studio dantesco. *Padova*: Tip. del Seminario, 1933. 202 pp. L. 3.50.

D'Azeglio, Massimo [Taparelli].—I miei ricordi. Nuova edizione scolastica con note a cura di F. Zublena. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1933. viii + 432 pp. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Del Buono, Luigi [Stenterello].—Darò mia figlia al migliore offerente, e altre stenterellate. A cura di G. Cocchiara. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1933. 264 pp. (Classici del ridere, no. 95.)

De Sanctis, F.—Nuovi saggi critici. Nuova edizione a cura di N. Cortese. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1933. 407 pp. L. 14.

—Saggi critici. Volume III. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1932. 539 pp. L. 22. (Opere complete, no. 10.)

Fabietti, E.—Mameli. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1933. xi + 177 pp. L. 20. (Biografie ed epistolari, no. 9.)

Falqui, E., e Capasso, A.—Il fiore della lirica italiana dalle origini a oggi. Con una nota dei compilatori e un saggio di A. Gargiulo. A cura di —. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1933. lix + 391 pp. L. 15.

Ferraris, U.—Criminali in D'Annunzio. *Genova*: Casa edit. "Apuania," 1933. 115 pp. L. 7.

Festa, Hilda Montesi.—Lineamenti ed esempi di letteratura italiana. A cura di —. Volume III. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1932. 432 pp. L. 15.

Figurelli, F.—Il dolce stil nuovo. *Napoli*: R. Ricciardi, 1933. 446 pp. L. 20.

Freda, E.—La concezione religiosa della vita nei Promessi Sposi. Conferenza. *Avellino*: C. Labruna, 1933. 30 pp.

Freund, Ilse.—Beiträge zur Mundart von Ischia. *Tübingen*: 1933. xxii + 98 pp. (Diss.)

Giordano, A.—Almanacco degli scrittori

— *Napoli*: Edit. "I quaderni di Athena," 1933. 244 pp. L. 25.

Goldoni, Carlo. — Un curioso accidente. Commedia in tre atti. Introduzione e note di G. Parisi. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1932. 79 pp. L. 3.

Leonetti, P. — Storia della tecnica del verso italiano. Parte prima: Gli elementi della tecnica. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1933. 66 pp. L. 6. (Repr. fr. the *Annuario Liceo V. Emanuele II di Napoli*.)

Machiavelli, Niccolò. — Prose politiche e storiche, scelte ed annotate da F. Föffano. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1933. 202 pp. L. 6. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Manzoni, Alessandro. — I Promessi Sposi. A cura di S. Caramella. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. 669 pp. L. 50. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 144.)

Meschieri, E. — Nuovo vocabolario mirandolese-italiano, compilato giusta le norme tracciate dal Ministero della pubblica istruzione per la pubblicazione di vocabolari dialettali. *Imola*: P. Galeati, 1932. lxxii + 891 pp. (Memorie storiche della città e dell'antico ducato della Mirandola, XXIII-XXIV.)

Nicoletti, L. — I personaggi dei Promessi Sposi. Con uno studio sul mondo poetico, morale e religioso del Manzoni. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. viii + 149 pp. L. 8.

Pagliani, A. P. — Catalogo generale della Libreria italiana dall'anno 1900 a tutto il 1920. Indice per materie: A-D (Volume I, fascicolo I). *Milano*: Catalogo generale Libreria italiana, 1933. 64 pp. L. 25.

Palmarocchi, R. — La politica italiana di Lorenzo De' Medici. Firenze nella guerra contro Innocenzo VIII. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. ix + 314 pp. L. 40. (Biblioteca storica toscana, a cura della r. Deputazione toscana di storia patria, no. 8.)

Poggiolini, O. — Corpi e ombre. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 249 pp. L. 10.

Porta, Carlo. — Poesie milanesi. A cura di G. Decio e di L. M. Capelli. Precede uno studio di E. Rota su "Il riso di C. Porta e il giansenismo." *Milano*: "La famiglia meneghina," 1933. cxlvii + 666 pp. L. 25. (I libri della Famiglia meneghina, no. 21-22.)

Ricolfi, A. — Studi sui "fedeli d'amore." I: Le "corti d'amore" in Francia ed i loro riflessi in Italia. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1933. v + 89 pp. L. 6.50. (Biblioteca della "Nuova rivista storica," no. 11.)

Rinaldi, A. — Traiano Boccalini e la sua critica letteraria. *Venezia*: "Rinascenza," 1933. 104 pp. L. 12.50. (Collana "Saturnia tellus.")

Savonarola, Girolamo. — Prediche italiane ai fiorentini. III. 1: Quaresimale del 1496,

*Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1933. xii + 504 pp. L. 40. (Documenti di storia italiana, I, 3, 1.)

Società italiana, I primi cinquanta anni della — degli autori ed editori. *Milano*: Alfieri e Lacroix, 1933. 40 pp. L. 3.

Sorbelli, A. — Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia. Volume LII: Pesaro. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. 4to., 422 pp. L. 80.

Tadini, A. — Ancora della vita e degli scritti di Pietro Custodi. *Novara*: E. Cattaneo, 1927. 176 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Bollettino storico per la provincia di Novara," 21.)

Tasso, Torquato. — Aminta. Con introduzione e commento di G. Petronio. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1933. xiv + 106 pp. L. 4. ("Semina flammae.")

Tonelli, L. — L'amore nella poesia e nel pensiero del Rinascimento. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. 323 pp. L. 25.

Ugolini, F. A. — I cantari d'argomento classico. Con un'appendice di testi inediti. *Genève-Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. 275 pp. Frs. 15. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum romanicum," serie I, vol. 19.)

Vicinelli, A. — La letteratura d'Italia per le scuole medie superiori. Volume I. Storia e opere d'autori dalle origini al secolo XV. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1933. xix + 522 pp. L. 15.

Zizzo, G. — L'Ariosto e il suo poema. *Catania*: De Gaetani e Privitera, 1933. 24 pp. L. 3.

## SPANISH

Alonso Cortés, N. — Ejercicios de gramática castellana. *Valladolid*: Aguado, 1932. 160 pp. 7 ptas.

Ambrozzi, L. — Cervantes e il "Quijote." *Torino*: Edit. L'Erma, 1933. 24 pp.

Anibal, C. E. — Observations on *La Estrella de Sevilla*. *Philadelphia*: Lancaster Press, 1934. 38 pp. (Repr. from *Hispanic Review*, Vol. II.)

Bayle, C. — Historia de los descubrimientos y colonización de los Padres de la Compañía de Jesús en la Baja California. *Madrid*: Fax, 1933. 238 pp.

Blanco-Fombona, R. — Camino de imperfección. Diario de mi vida, 1906-1914. *Madrid*: Edit. América [1933]. 384 pp.

Brereton, G. — Quelques précisions sur les sources d'Espronceda. *Paris*: Jouve & Cie, 1933. 145 pp. (Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Paris.)

Brouwer, J. — Hernán Cortés en Montezuma. *Zutphen*: Ed. Thieme, 1933. 378 pp. 7.50 fls.

Castro, J. R. — Ensayo de una Biblioteca Tudelana. *Tudela*: Imp. Castilla, 1933. xvi

Rauch, Erich.—Zum Freundschaftsproblem im Leben und Werk A. Gides. Diss. *Jena*: 1933. 51 pp.

Rech, Bruno.—Grundbegriffe und Wertbegriffe bei Michel de Montaigne. Diss. *Berlin*: 1931. 56 pp.

Rickey, H. W.—Musset Shakespearien. Diss. *Bordeaux*: 1932. 193 pp.

Rutebeuf.—Le Miracle de Théophile, transposition de G. Cohen. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1934. 64 pp.

Schellenberg, G.—Bemerkungen zum Trait des Walter von Bibbesworth. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 70 pp.

Schoumacker, L.—Erckmann-Chatrian. Diss. *Strasbourg*: 1933. 409 pp.

—Un inédit d'Emile Erckmann. Diss. *Ibid.*, 1933. 93 pp.

Schreiber, Lotte.—Leben und Denken im Werk von A. Gide. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 45 pp.

Scribner, H. M.—Pierre Loti vu à travers son œuvre. Diss. *Poitiers*: 1932. 194 pp.

Semiontek, H.—L'Enfant et la litt. enfantine contemp. en Fr. Diss. *Toulouse*: 1932. 146 pp.

Souza, Sybil de.—L'Influence de Ruskin sur Proust. Diss. *Montpellier*: 1932. 158 pp.

Tipping, W. M.—Jean Regnaud de Segrais. Diss. *Paris*: 1933. 263 pp.

Trahard, P.—Les maîtres de la sensibilité fr. au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. (1715-89). T. IV. *Paris*: Boivin, 1933. 357 pp.

Tuong, N. M.—Essai sur la valeur dramatique d'A. de Musset. Diss. *Montpellier*: 1932. 45 pp.

—L'Annan dans la litt. fr. Jules Boissière (1863-97). Diss. *Ibid.*, 1932. 227 pp.

Vadasz, Elvira.—Studien zu Rivarol. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 47 pp.

Van Vree, Th. J.—Les Pamphlets et libelles littéraires contre Molière. Diss. *Paris*: (1933). 293 pp.

Zapf, Hasso.—Syntaktische Eigentümlichkeiten in den Werken Edouard Escaunié's. Diss. *Jena*: 1933. viii + 47 pp.

## ITALIAN

Agnelli, G., e Ravagnani, G.—Annali delle edizioni ariostee. Con CXIV tavole fuori testo. Pubblicati sotto il patrocinio della Reale Accademia d'Italia e del Comitato ferrarese per le onoranze al poeta. Volume primo e secondo. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1933. 2 vols., xxii + 301, 396 pp. L. 150.

Allodoli, E., e Trompeo, P. P.—Pagine classiche. Manuale di letteratura italiana per le scuole medie superiori, a cura di —. Volume II: Da Ludovico Ariosto a Giambattista Vico. Volume III: Dall'Arcadia ai giorni nostri, parte prima. *Torino*: G. B.

Paravia e C., 1933. 2 vols., iv + 539, iv + 438 pp. L. 23, 20.

Belotti, B.—Pietro Ruggeri, poeta bergamasco. *Bergamo*: I quaderni di "Il pensiero," 1933. 164 pp. L. 15.

Bonfigli, L.—Pagine sparse, precedute da cenni e ricordi dei professori E. Carrara, A. Donati, L. Falchi, I. Sanesi. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1933. liii + 280 pp.

Bracciolini, Poggio.—Facezie. *Milano*: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1933. 230 pp. L. 5.

Cuoco, Vincenzo.—Platone in Italia. Traduzione dal greco con introduzione e note di G. Saitta. Volume II. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1933. 357 pp. L. 12. (Collana di testi filosofici e pedagogici, no. 14.)

D'Alessandro, A.—La dottrina cattolica nella Divina Commedia. Studio dantesco. *Padova*: Tip. del Seminario, 1933. 202 pp. L. 3.50.

D'Azeglio, Massimo [Taparelli].—I miei ricordi. Nuova edizione scolastica con note a cura di F. Zublena. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1933. viii + 432 pp. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Del Buono, Luigi [Stenterello].—Darò mia figlia al migliore offerente, e altre stenterellate. A cura di G. Cocchiara. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1933. 264 pp. (Classici del ridere, no. 95.)

De Sanctis, F.—Nuovi saggi critici. Nuova edizione a cura di N. Cortese. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1933. 407 pp. L. 14.

—Saggi critici. Volume III. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1932. 539 pp. L. 22. (Opere complete, no. 10.)

Fabietti, E.—Mameli. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1933. xi + 177 pp. L. 20. (Biografie ed epistolari, no. 9.)

Falqui, E., e Capasso, A.—Il fiore della lirica italiana dalle origini a oggi. Con una nota dei compilatori e un saggio di A. Gargiulo. A cura di —. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1933. lix + 391 pp. L. 15.

Ferraris, U.—Criminali in D'Annunzio. *Genova*: Casa edit. "Apuania," 1933. 115 pp. L. 7.

Festa, Hilda Montesi.—Lineamenti ed esempi di letteratura italiana. A cura di —. Volume III. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1932. 432 pp. L. 15.

Figurelli, F.—Il dolce stil nuovo. *Napoli*: R. Ricciardi, 1933. 446 pp. L. 20.

Freda, E.—La concezione religiosa della vita nei Promessi Sposi. Conferenza. *Avellino*: C. Labruna, 1933. 30 pp.

Freund, Ilse.—Beiträge zur Mundart von Ischia. *Tübingen*: 1933. xxii + 98 pp. (Diss.)

Giordano, A.—Almanacco degli scrittori nostri di oggi e di domani: 1933. A cura di

— *Napoli*: Edit. "I quaderni di Athena," 1933. 244 pp. L. 25.

Goldoni, Carlo. — Un curioso accidente. Commedia in tre atti. Introduzione e note di G. Parisi. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1932. 79 pp. L. 3.

Leonetti, P. — Storia della tecnica del verso italiano. Parte prima: Gli elementi della tecnica. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1933. 66 pp. L. 6. (Repr. fr. the *Annuario Liceo V. Emanuele II di Napoli*.)

Machiavelli, Niccolò. — Prose politiche e storiche, scelte ed annotate da F. Foffano. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1933. 202 pp. L. 6. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Manzoni, Alessandro. — I Promessi Sposi. A cura di S. Caramella. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. 669 pp. L. 50. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 144.)

Meschieri, E. — Nuovo vocabolario mirandolese-italiano, compilato giusta le norme tracciate dal Ministero della pubblica istruzione per la pubblicazione di vocabolari dialettali. *Imola*: P. Galeati, 1932. lxxii + 891 pp. (Memorie storiche della città e dell'antico ducato della Mirandola, XXIII-XXIV.)

Nicoletti, L. — I personaggi dei Promessi Sposi. Con uno studio sul mondo poetico, morale e religioso del Manzoni. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. viii + 149 pp. L. 8.

Pagliaini, A. P. — Catalogo generale della Libreria italiana dall'anno 1900 a tutto il 1920. Indice per materie: A-D (Volume I, fascicolo I). *Milano*: Catalogo generale Libreria italiana, 1933. 64 pp. L. 25.

Palmarocchi, R. — La politica italiana di Lorenzo De' Medici. Firenze nella guerra contro Innocenzo VIII. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. ix + 314 pp. L. 40. (Biblioteca storica toscana, a cura della R. Deputazione toscana di storia patria, no. 8.)

Poggiolini, O. — Corpi e ombre. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 249 pp. L. 10.

Porta, Carlo. — Poesie milanesi. A cura di G. Decio e di L. M. Capelli. Precede uno studio di E. Rota su "Il riso di C. Porta e il giansenismo." *Milano*: "La famiglia meneghina," 1933. cxlvii + 666 pp. L. 25. (I libri della Famiglia meneghina, no. 21-22.)

Ricolfi, A. — Studi sui "fedeli d'amore." I: Le "corti d'amore" in Francia ed i loro riflessi in Italia. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1933. v + 89 pp. L. 6.50. (Biblioteca della "Nuova rivista storica," no. 11.)

Rinaldi, A. — Traiano Boccalini e la sua critica letteraria. *Venezia*: "Rinascenza," 1933. 104 pp. L. 12.50. (Collana "Saturnia tellus.")

Savonarola, Girolamo. — Prediche italiane ai fiorentini. III. 1: Quaresimale del 1496, prediche I-XXIII. A cura di R. Palmarocchi.

*Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1933. xii + 504 pp. L. 40. (Documenti di storia italiana, I, 3, 1.)

Società italiana, I primi cinquanta anni della — degli autori ed editori. *Milano*: Alfieri e Lacroix, 1933. 40 pp. L. 3.

Sorbelli, A. — Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia. Volume LII: Pesaro. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. 4to., 422 pp. L. 80.

Tadini, A. — Ancora della vita e degli scritti di Pietro Custodi. *Novara*: E. Cattaneo, 1927. 176 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Bollettino storico per la provincia di Novara," 21.)

Tasso, Torquato. — Aminta. Con introduzione e commento di G. Petronio. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1933. xiv + 106 pp. L. 4. ("Semina flammae.")

Tonelli, L. — L'amore nella poesia e nel pensiero del Rinascimento. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. 323 pp. L. 25.

Ugolini, F. A. — I cantari d'argomento classico. Con un'appendice di testi inediti. *Genève-Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. 275 pp. Frs. 15. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum romanicum," serie I, vol. 19.)

Vicinelli, A. — La letteratura d'Italia per le scuole medie superiori. Volume I. Storia e opere d'autori dalle origini al secolo XV. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1933. xix + 522 pp. L. 15.

Zizzo, G. — L'Ariosto e il suo poema. *Catania*: De Gaetani e Privitera, 1933. 24 pp. L. 3.

## SPANISH

Alonso Cortés, N. — Ejercicios de gramática castellana. *Valladolid*: Aguado, 1932. 160 pp. 7 ptas.

Ambruzzi, L. — Cervantes e il "Quijote." *Torino*: Edit. L'Erma, 1933. 24 pp.

Anibal, C. E. — Observations on *La Estrella de Sevilla*. *Philadelphia*: Lancaster Press, 1934. 38 pp. (Repr. from *Hispanic Review*, Vol. II.)

Bayle, C. — Historia de los descubrimientos y colonización de los Padres de la Compañía de Jesús en la Baja California. *Madrid*: Fax, 1933. 238 pp.

Blanco-Fombona, R. — Camino de perfección. Diario de mi vida, 1906-1914. *Madrid*: Edit. América [1933]. 384 pp.

Brereton, G. — Quelques précisions sur les sources d'Espronceda. *Paris*: Jouve & Cie, 1933. 145 pp. (Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Paris.)

Brouwer, J. — Hernán Cortés en Montezuma. *Zutphen*: Ed. Thieme, 1933. 378 pp. 7.50 fls.

Castro, J. R. — Ensayo de una Biblioteca Tudelana. *Tudela*: Imp. Castilla, 1933. xvi + 294 pp. 25 ptas.

Cejador, J.—Historia de la lengua y literatura castellana. Tomo I. 3ª ed. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1932-33. 2 vols. viii + 356 and 310 pp. 25 ptas.

Chevallier, Dom.—Les mots d'ordre de Saint Jean de la Croix. *Paris*: Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie, 1933. 124 pp. 7.50 frs.

Fissen, K.—Des Spaniers gebräuchlichster Wortschatz. *Berlin*: F. Dümmler, 1933. 71 pp. 2.60 ms.

Granada, Fr. Luis de.—Obras. Pról. y la vida del autor por J. J. de Mora. Tomo II. *Madrid*: Hernando [193?]. 615 pp. 15 ptas.

Gutiérrez Nájera, M.—Sus mejores poesías. *México*: Edit. Libros mexicanos, 1933. 64 pp.

Hüffer, H.—La idea imperial española, con un pról. de R. Menéndez Pidal. *Madrid*: Blass, 1933. 57 pp.

Madol, H. R.—Godoy. El primer dictador de nuestro tiempo. *Madrid*: "Rev. de Occidente," 1933. 251 pp. 14 ptas.

Málaga García, E.—Lengua española. Tomo I. Ortografía, Prosodia, Morfología, Generalidades de la Gramática. *Cáceres*: García Floriano, 1932. 267 + vii pp. and 210 + vii pp.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—Flor Nueva de Romances Viejos que recogió de la tradición antigua y moderna. . . Segunda edición, aumentada. *Madrid*: Tip. de Arch., 1933. 316 pp. 10 ptas.

Meyer, H.—Der spanische Dolmetscher. El Interpreté alemán. *Berlin*: O. Worte [1933]. 142 pp. 5 ms.

Millares Cubas, L. y A.—Cómo hablan los canarios. Refundición del "Léxico de Gran Canaria" hecha por A. Millares Cubas. *Las Palmas*: Tin. "Diario de las Palmas" [1933?]. xi + 167 pp.

Osuna, F. de.—Via alla mistica. Introduzione generale sulla mistica spagnola, versione e note di G. M. Bertini. Premessa di A. Farinelli. *Brescia*: Morcelliana, 1933. cxx + 176 pp. (Mistici di Spagna, I.)

Paz, J.—Catálogo de manuscritos de América existentes en la Biblioteca Nacional [de Madrid]. *Madrid*: Tip. de Arch., 1933. viii + 724 pp. 40 ptas.

Peeters-Fontainas, J.—Bibliographie des Impressions Espagnoles des Pays-Bas. *Ansvers*: Musée Plantin-Moretus, 1933. xiv + 245 pp.

Proceso inquisitorial contra el escultor Esteban Jamete.—Transcripción, extractos y notas preliminares, por J. Domínguez Bordona. *Madrid*: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1933. xxvi + 74 pp.

Reyes, A.—Romances del Río de Enero. *Moesrich*: Stols, 1933. 37 pp.

Rodríguez Moñino, A. R.—Dictados tópicos de Extremadura. Materiales para una colección folklórica recogidos, ordenados,

comentados y concordados por. . . *Badajoz*: A. Arqueros, 1933. 364 pp.

Rodríguez Moure, J.—Historia de las Universidades Canarias. *Tenerife*: Inst. de Estudios Canarios, 1933. 147 pp. 4 ptas.

Sauer, C. M.—Kleine spanische Sprachlehre für den Gebrauch in Schulen und zum Selbstunterricht. *Heidelberg*: J. Gross, 1933. xii + 243 pp.

Teixidor, F.—Anuario bibliográfico mexicano de 1932. *México*: Imp. de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1933. 407 pp.

Toro, M. de.—L'évolution de la langue espagnole en Argentine. *Paris*: Librairie Larousse, 1933. vi + 199 pp.

—Un fragmento del diccionario general de la lengua española. *Paris*: Librairie Larousse [1933?]. x + 82 pp.

Ugarte, E. y J. López Rubio.—De la noche a la mañana. Ed. with intr. and notes by G. T. Starck. *New York*: Norton and Co., 1934. xxi + 108 pp. \$1.30.

Underwood, E. W.—Anthology of Mexican Poets from the earliest times to today. 1580-1932. *Portland, Ma.*: The Mosher Press, 1932. 350 pp.

Vega, Lope de.—Comedia famosa del "Quien todo lo quiere. . ." *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 1.20 ptas. (Colección Universal.)

—Comedia famosa del "Sembrar en buena tierra." *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 1.20 ptas. (Colección Universal.)

## GENERAL

Ahleff, H.—Vulgärlateinisch-Romanische Denkformen in lateinischen Heiligenleben der Karolingerzeit. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. vi + 57 pp.

Appel, Carl.—Die Singweisen Bernart's von Ventadorn. *Haale*: Niemeyer, 1934. 46 pp. 8 plates. M. 6.

De Bosis, Lauro.—The Story of My Death. 32 pp. \$1.00.

Dieperink, G. J.—Studien zum Valentin und Namelos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der literarischen Beziehungen zwischen Flandern, Mittel- u. Niederdeutschland und Schweden zur Zeit der Hanse. [Nederlandsche Bijdragen of het gebied van Germaansche philologie en linguistik. 3]. *Haarlem*: H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1933. 163 pp. Fl. 2.50.

Grand'Combe, Félix de [Félix Boillot].—Modestes Conseils à un Conférencier *Paris*: Presses univ., 1933. 109 pp.

Lipsker, Erika.—Der Mythos vom goldenen Zeitalter in den Schäferdichtungen Italiens, Spaniens und Frankreichs zur Zeit der Renaissance. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 103 pp.

Reichenkron, G.—Passivum, Medium und Reflexivum in den romanischen Sprachen. Diss. *Berlin*: 1932. x + 41 pp.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIX

APRIL, 1934

Number 4

---

## CHAUCER'S MISSION TO LOMBARDY

Some of the new facts which Mr. Braddy derives from the account of Sir Edward de Berkeley's mission to Lombardy in 1378 had long been known to attentive students of Chaucer's account of his expenses on the same mission. Chaucer does not tell us that he crossed to the continent from Dover to Calais as Sir Edward does,<sup>1</sup> but he does tell us quite as definitely as Berkeley does that

<sup>1</sup> Braddy in *MLN.*, XLVIII, 507-11. In printing this document Mr. Braddy does not indicate the interesting, though unimportant, fact that the account contained several corrections, perhaps due merely to original errors of the scribe. These are that the name of the month "Maij" was written over an erasure; that the amount paid for passage and repassage was originally written as *xli* and changed to *x mar*; and that the original authority for the payment was "*per Breue Secreti Sigilli*." The correction in the expenses of course causes corresponding corrections in the sum total and the amount still due from Sir Edward. There are a few errors in Mr. Braddy's transcription due to erroneous expansions, but these also are of no importance for the general argument.

Mr. Braddy prints Sir Edward's account from E 101/318/7, a photostat of which lies before me. Another copy of the same account is contained in Foreign Accounts 13, which differs not only in minutiae of phrasing but also in a few statements of fact: (1) Sir John Haukwode is not mentioned in the *titulus* or under *Expensa* but is joined with Barnabo under *Recepta* in the same terms that appear in the *compotus* printed by Mr. Braddy: "*versus partes predictas Lumbardie tam ad dictum dominum de Melan quam ad Johannem de Haukwode predictis negociis expeditionem guerre Regis tangentibus*"—suggesting possibly that Barnabo and Sir John were to be treated with separately; (2) the date of the Privy Seal directed to the Treasurer, Barons, and Chamberlains is given as February 20, 3 Richard II; (3) the accounting is to be made with Sir Edward "*vel cum alia persona sufficienti nomine suo per sacramentum vnus eorum*," and the accounting was actually made with William Overton "*attornatum ipsius Edwardi*"; (4) it is added in regard to the wages that they shall be such as were allowed in the first year of the present king to the same Edward for going on similar missions of the King's grandfather to Gascony and

he traveled with several horses and therefore equally suggests that the journey was made overland. The language of *Life Records*, N<sup>o</sup> 122<sup>2</sup> is "Et in passagio et repassagio suo, hominum et equorum suorum, iij*l*." Chaucerians therefore have known that the journey was made overland and not by sea.

Mr. Braddy says, "The present record also states that ten persons, and not Chaucer alone, figured in Sir Edward's company." It is true that there were ten persons, including Sir Edward himself, in his party, but Chaucer was not one of the ten, as is clear from the fact that he had a party of his own.<sup>3</sup> That this party consisted of six persons, including himself, we may infer from the fact that he paid 6 marcs (4*l*) for passage and repassage of the sea, whereas Sir Edward paid 10 marcs. The expense of passage and repassage of the sea at Dover varied very considerably according to circumstances.<sup>4</sup> Chaucer himself listed this expense in the 1372

Navarre; (5) the number of men in Sir Edward's party is not mentioned; (6) and after the debit entry of x*l* xiijs iij*d* comes the entry, "Et respondet in Rotulo secundo in Glouc'."

<sup>2</sup> The Privy Seal letter, in French, directing the Treasurer, Barons, and Chamberlains of the Exchequer to account with Chaucer for the Lombardy mission, which is recited in Latin in N<sup>o</sup> 122, is preserved in C 404-12-78. A copy of the letter, also in French, is entered on the Memoranda Roll K. R. (E 159) E 156. For an exact reference it is necessary to add, "Adhuc Brevia directa Baronibus de Scaccario de termino Pasche anno tercio Regis Ricardi secundi, m. 10 d.;" the Memoranda Roll is numbered only under the sections and terms. This is one of the writs referred to in Note 1 on *L. R.* 122. There is a slight discrepancy between the record here and the last sentence of N<sup>o</sup> 122. After reciting the letter this record continues thus: "hoc breue liberatur ad Receptam scaccarij xiiij die Julij hoc termino," etc.

<sup>3</sup> In 1366 Sir Richard Stafford was sent to Flanders *in comitiva* of the Earl of Warwick; both rendered accounts for 17 days' wages (Oct. 20-Nov. 5), but Sir Richard paid nothing for passage or repassage of the sea because the Earl paid for both — 12*l*. 19*s*. 9*d*. (E 101/315/15 and 20).

<sup>4</sup> Even when the number of men and horses was the same, the charges varied. So Master Thomas de Bukton, going to Flanders and France in 1366, "computat in passagio de Douorr' hominum et v*j* equorum versus Cales' xxijs v*d* ob viz. pro quolibet equo ijs ix*d*. Et pro custumariis pontagio et batellagio vijs v*d*. Item computat in repassagio de Cales' vsque Douorr' hominum et sex equorum suorum xxvjs ix*d* viz. pro quolibet equo iij*s* v*d*. Ac pro custumariis pontagio et batillagio . . . ijs viij*d*." The errors are in the original (E 101/315/5).

When an envoy traveled as a member of a party, he seems sometimes to have paid only some minor expenses. Thus Master Doctor John Shepeye



journey to Italy (obviously also an overland journey) as 30s (*L. R.*, N° 72); for the first journey in 1377 as 33s 4d; and for the second journey in that year as 20s (*L. R.*, N° 101). Experienced travelers, like Chaucer, Sir Edward,<sup>5</sup> and dozens of others who could be named, usually listed their expenses *en gros*.<sup>6</sup> So great is the variation that, without the aid of the detailed information — 'ten men and ten horses with their trappings, ten marcs' — given in the account of Chaucer's associate, Sir Edward, we could not have been certain that the 4l (six marcs) of Chaucer's account represented the passage and repassage of six men and six horses.<sup>7</sup>

It seems probable from the Privy Seal writ addressed to Walworth and Philipot on May 13 that Berkeley and Chaucer were the only persons officially appointed for the mission, their men being chosen and paid by themselves. The writ reads as follows:

---

traveling to and from Flanders in 1372 "cum familia et equis suis" pays only "in pontagio iiij equorum iiijd in portagio vjd, in batellagio vjd et apud Cales' in batillagio et portagio vjd; in repassagio . . . in portagio et batillagio iiij s vjd." (E 101/316/5).

<sup>5</sup> On his two visits to Bruges in connection with the peace negotiations in the winter and spring of 1379 (not in 1378, as Mr. Braddy says, *Three Chaucer Studies*, p. 19 and n. 19), there was no expense for crossing the sea, as he started from the *castrum de Merke* near Calais and returned to it on both occasions (E 101/318/7).

<sup>6</sup> So, for example, Sir John de Cobham in 1375 reports 119s 7d; Reginald de Neuport, armiger (a very frequent messenger of the King) reports for four journeys in 1375 and 1376 a lump sum of 6l for crossing the sea; the Earl of Salisbury, going to Calais for the peace negotiations of May-June 1377, reports 20l; Sir John Clanvowe, going to the same place for the same purpose in 1385, reports passage to Calais 40s, repassage Calais to Dover 40s (E 101/317/11; *ib.*, 316/39; *ib.*, 317/30; *ib.*, 319/14). On the other hand, Master John Haseley, M. A. of Oxford, sent to Paris "in certis negociis Regis statum regni specialiter concernentibus" in June 1396, renders an itemized account (E 101, 320/14) of what he spent for beer, wine, lodgings, breakfast, dinner, supper, stabling, "beel chere", at various towns, and at Dover for victuals for the ship, for putting the horses on the ship, for horse-feed on the ship, for towing the ship, etc., etc. Master Doctor John Shepeye also usually gave a very detailed account; in 1373 it was so detailed that many of the items were disallowed because he had no warrant for them (E 101/316/28).

<sup>7</sup> Except when the purpose of the journey was the transfer of horses the number of men usually agreed with the number of horses. Sometimes the account is detailed: For Norman de Swynford with three esquires, six vallets, and ten horses, crossing at Southampton for Brittany, 10 April, 42 Ed. III (Chancery Warrants, Bills of Privy Seal, C 81/915/36).

Richard par la grace de dieu Roy Dengleterre et de ffrance et Seignur Dirlande A noz bien amez William Walworth et Johan Phelipot Receuours de noz deniers pur la guerre saluz Nous volons del auis de nostre conseil et vous mandons que a nostre cher et feal Chiualer Edward de Berkle et a nostre feal Esquier Geffray Chaucer qi sont ordenez daler en nostre Message sibien [inserted above the line] au sire de Melan Barnabo come a nostre cher et foial Johan Haukwode es parties de Lumbardie pur ascunes busoignes touchantes leexploit de nostre guerre vous deliueriez les sommes qensuent cestassauoir au dit Edward deux Centz marz et au dit Geffray Cent marz sur leur gages pur le dit voiage Et cestes noz lettres vous enserront garrant Done souz nostre priue seel a Westm' le xiiij Jour de May lan de nostre regne primer.<sup>8</sup>

Chaucer was, then, not a mere messenger or an undistinguished member of Sir Edward's party. He was his colleague, though of lower rank and dignity. Mr. Braddy rightly supposes that further search in the records may disclose the names of other members of the Lombardy mission. No doubt the best chance of finding such names arises from the issuance of letters of protection and letters of general attorney. One member of the mission was certainly "Stephen Wyndesor herald," who procured the issuance of letters of general attorney ('to go with Sir Edward Berkeley to Lombardy'), May 28, 1378 (C 76/62 m. 4).<sup>9</sup>

Mr. Braddy, reading the Issue Roll for Easter, 1 Rich. II (*L. R.*, N° 121), as implying that John of Gaunt's army was paid off the very day (May 28) that Berkeley and Chaucer obtained advances from the Receivers for the King's Wars and began their journey to Lombardy, suggests that some of the disbanded men may have been added to the Lombardy mission. But Chaucer had been selected for the mission as early as May 10 (Letters of Protection, *L. R.*, N° 118). And I do not read the Roll as meaning that the army was paid May 28, but only that on that day the Receivers turned in their accounts (22,334*l* 12*s*) for enrollment. John of Gaunt is recorded as having received 4,244*l* 18*s* for paying the army on April 7.

Moreover the payment of Sir Guichard d'Angle for 'being in the parts of Flanders for the treaty of peace between the King and his adversary of France' is not equivalent to mentioning him

<sup>8</sup> E 101. 37/27-75. The same document (except *duc de Melan* for *sire de M.*) was printed in the *Athenaeum*, Sept. 9, 1893, p. 356, from Exch. Treas. of Receipt, Misc. 43/8/75.

<sup>9</sup> Sir Edward Berkeley's letters for the same journey were procured May 24 (*ibid.*).

"as a knight in John of Gaunt's service." The payment to Sir Guichard, like the advances to Sir Edward de Berkeley and Chaucer, is charged against the expenses of the war and entered in this memorandum because his mission to treat for peace, like theirs to secure aid, was regarded as part of the expenses of the war. There is, therefore, no implication here that Sir Guichard was in John of Gaunt's service except in this remote way.

There was no suggestion in *Life Records*, N<sup>o</sup> 121, that the "many noblemen, knights, officials, and others" who received payments from the "monies for the war" were released and thereby became available for the mission to Lombardy. John of Gaunt was not disbanding his followers; on the contrary, he had not yet begun to fight. Preparations for his expedition had been under way for some time. On March 4 letters of protection until Michaelmas were issued to John Noreys, 'miles', and others to join John of Gaunt in his expedition (Rymer, VII, 186); on May 20 Letters Patent were issued appointing Richard Imbrigg, King's Sergeant at Arms, to enlist one hundred mariners at Essex to go to Sandwich for the expedition (*ibid.*, 195); similar letters were issued on May 24 to John Orewell, Sergeant at Arms, to enlist sixty men in the waters and coasts of the Thames and the Medway (*ibid.*, 196); on June 15 a writ was issued ordering Thomas, Earl of Buckingham, and seven others to survey the muster of John of Gaunt's men and report to the council any deficiencies that might be found (*ibid.*, 199); letters of general attorney for Philip le Despenser, 'chivaler', and seven others, including the Earl of Suffolk and Sir Edward de Berkeley, were issued on June 18 (*ibid.*, 199 f.); while on June 16 letters of protection were issued to 'Johannes Fysher rypyer' and seventeen others (*ibid.*, 200 f.).<sup>10</sup>

Whether Chaucer was sent to Bruges on the mission of January 1378, I am not prepared to say, but it seems quite certain that Mr. Braddy is wrong in suggesting that Sir Hugh Segrave, who had been named as one of the three envoys, did not go and that

<sup>10</sup> The Letters Patent acknowledging loans for the war and giving the amounts of the loans, dated March 6, may be found in Rymer, VII, 210-13. The list of subscribers includes John of Gaunt and other members of the nobility, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a number of bishops and abbots. Whether Johannes Haukewode of Essex, who lent 20*l*, was the famous leader whom Berkeley and Chaucer went to consult or a relative, I have not inquired.

Chaucer took his place. We perhaps could not infer that Sir Hugh actually served on the peace and marriage mission from the fact that on April 5 he was joined with Sir Guichard d'Angle and Dr. Skirlawe, his associates on the peace mission, in a new mission to the Count of Flanders and the towns of Ghent, Bruges, and Ypres to renew and, if necessary, to expand the treaties which had existed between England and Flanders (Rymer VII, 189 f.), but a hitherto unpublished document — a mandate under the Privy Seal — seems to put the matter beyond any doubt.

Nous vous mandons que a noz treschers et foialx Guychard Dangle conte de Huntingdon et Hugh de Segraue Chivaler et mestre Wauter Skirlawe Doctour en leys noz messages esteanz es parties de fflandres a cause de trette de pees entre nous et nostre aduersaire de ffrance paieiz cestassauoir au dit conte cent liures au dit Hugh quarante liures et au dit Wauter quarante liures sur leur gages a cause de leur message susdit Et ces presentes vous enserront garant Donne souz nostre priue seal a Westm' le tierz iour Dauerill lan de notre regne primer.

A noz bien amez William Walworth et Johan Philipot Receyuour de noz deniers pour la guerre. (E 101. 37/27-48. The seal is very well preserved.)

Sir Hugh's presence in England on March 15 would not justify Mr. Braddy in inferring that Sir Hugh "after being appointed was replaced or for some reason was unable to join the expedition". He may easily have returned to England for a visit while the negotiations were in progress. Two of the three commissioners were empowered to carry on the negotiations, and the detailed account given by Nicolas de Bosc of the manner in which the conferences of 1381 at Lelighen were conducted indicates, not only that the proceedings were leisurely, but that some members of the French party visited Paris for additional instructions or other purposes during the progress of the negotiations.<sup>11</sup>

We might dismiss the alleged replacement of Sir Thomas Percy by Sir Richard Stury in February 1377, which Mr. Braddy cites in support of his theory that Chaucer was substituted for Sir Hugh Segraue in January 1378, but the case deserves a word, as it too seems to be a mistaken interpretation of the record. Sir Thomas received an advance for the mission on Feb. 17 (*L. R.*, N° 100); Sir Richard began his journey to the 'parts of France' on that day, but he had already received, by the hands of his clerk, an advance

<sup>11</sup> Kervyn de Lettenhove, xxiii, 354-75, from *Bibl. Nat. de Paris*, f. fr. ms. 2699.

of 50 marcs on February 13. As this was four days earlier than the advances to Percy and Chaucer, Sir Richard can hardly be regarded as having been appointed to take Percy's place. Moreover, we do not know certainly that Percy did not go on his mission as planned. It is true that no one has yet found his expense account, but neither has anyone cited any evidence that the 33*l* 6*s* 8*d* advanced to him was ever repaid or otherwise accounted for — and the King's Exchequer was not rich enough to be careless about so much real money.

P. S.—I have tried to show that Mr. Braddy was mistaken in asserting that Sir Hugh de Segrave did not go to Flanders in January 1378 with Guichard D'Angle, Earl of Huntington, and Dr. Skirlawe, and in suggesting that Geoffrey Chaucer took his place. I have cited a payment indicating Segrave's participation in the mission. Since I came to London I have found his account (the existence of which Mr. Braddy denied). It is contained in E 364/12 m. D dors. (L. T. R. Foreign Accts.), and reads substantially as follows:

Account of Hugh Segrave, Knt., for receipts and expenses in two journeys made by him as the King's *nuncius* in parts beyond the seas, namely: [i] once to the parts of Flanders in the company of Guichard Dangle, Earl of Huntingdon, to treat of peace between the King and his adversary of France and [ii] once to the parts of Calais for the establishment of peace between the King of England and the Earl of Flanders;

by the King's writ of P. S. 7 Oct. 2 Ric. II directed to the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer, which is among the Communia of Michaelmas Term 2 Ric. II, by which the King commanded them to account with the said Hugh on his oath concerning the said journeys and concerning the moneys by him received by reason of the said journeys at the Receipt of the Exchequer or from William Walworth and John Philipot, Receivers of the King's Moneys for War, allowing him [etc.]

*Receipts.* He renders account for 180 *l* (60 *l*, 40 *l*, 40 *l*, and 40 *l*).

*Expenses.* He accounts for his wages at 20 *s* per day from 22 Jan. 1 Ric. II, on which day he left London for Flanders on his first voyage until 1 June following, on which day he returned, going, staying, and returning 131 days inclusive—131 *l*; and in wages on his second voyage from 26 June 2 Ric. II, on which day he left the city of London for the said parts of Calais, until 4 Aug., when he returned, going, staying, and returning for 40 days inclusive—40 *l*; and for his passages and repassages in the said voyages 9 *l*. 2 *s*. 7 *d*. He has surplus of 2 *s*. 7 *d*., which is allowed.

We can hardly ask for better evidence that Segrave went on the mission with Guichard D'Angle than this statement of his ex-

penses, sworn to by him and allowed by the King's auditor. There is therefore no basis for Mr. Braddy's suggestion that Chaucer took his place. The fact that Segrave is to receive funds for his mission from Walworth and Phillipot, Receivers of the King's Moneys for War, also confirms my rejection of Mr. Braddy's suggestion that the payment to D'Angle from the Receivers of Moneys for the War implied that he was in the train of John of Gaunt.

JOHN M. MANLY

*University of Chicago*

---

### THE SQUIRE AND THE NUMBER OF THE CANTERBURY PILGRIMS

Of the Canterbury pilgrims Miss Hammond remarks in her *Chaucer Manual*:

The number of pilgrims in the party and the lack of accordance with the "Wel nyne and twenty" announced by Chaucer in line 24, have occasioned much discussion (p. 269).

In the twenty-five years since her book was published little has been done to explain this discrepancy, which for the most part has been passed over in silence by recent commentators.<sup>1</sup> In reopening the question for consideration it will be well to begin by noting carefully Chaucer's exact words in the General Prologue:

In Southwerk at the Tabard as I lay  
Redy to wenden on my pilgrymage  
To Caunterbury with ful devout corage,  
At nyght was come into that hostelrye  
Wel nyne and twenty in a compaignye,  
Of sondry folk, by aventure yfalle  
In felawshipe, and pilgrimes were they alle,  
That toward Caunterbury wolden ryde.

The first point to be settled is whether in the number of these twenty-nine pilgrims Chaucer counted himself. He tells us, it is true, that he lost no time in making the acquaintance of the members of this company:

<sup>1</sup> Manly remarks in his note on l. 164: "Chaucer says in l. 24 that there were nine and twenty pilgrims assembled at the Tabard, and this is exactly accurate if only one priest is counted."

And shortly, whan the sonne was to reste,  
 So hadde I spoken with hem everichon,  
 That I was of hir felaweshipe anon.

In other words, he promptly enrolled himself as a recruit and "made forward" with the others "erly for to ryse" to begin the journey to Canterbury. Accordingly in speaking of the company later on in the Prologue (542-4) he adds himself:

Ther was also a Reve, and a Millere,  
 A Somnour, and a Pardoner also,  
 A Maunciple, and myself—ther were namo.

Chaucer tells us he was already at the Tabard before the arrival of the twenty-nine persons at nightfall. And his use of the third person, "and pilgrimes were *they* alle," decisively excludes him from the count. Also, in describing them as "by aventure yfalle In felaweshipe" the poet seems to suggest that they were already associated when they rode into the Southwerk inn-yard. It is clear, then, that Chaucer did not make one of the twenty-nine.

Turning to another phase of the question, one may note that Chaucer's phrase "wel twenty-nyne" has been taken by some as a round number. But Skeat is right in his note on line 24 that "*wel* is here used like our word *full* or *quite*." The phrase, therefore, is equivalent to "no less than twenty-nine," but it does not imply an inexact count. Nor does it seem justifiable to stretch the number as Skeat suggests in his note on *prestes three* in line 164:

If we are to keep the text (which stands alike in all MSS.) we must take '*wel nyne and twenty*' to mean '*at least nine and twenty*.'

The reason which led Chaucer to select this number of pilgrims has been very plausibly explained by Miss Hammond:

On this point I would remark that the pilgrimage of thirty which Chaucer at first planned is pretty evidently an artificial number; it is a large number because Chaucer's plans were usually large, and its nine-and-twenty plus Chaucer is directly comparable to the nineteen ladies plus Alceste of the Legend (*Manual*, p. 255).

The following is the list of the pilgrims as Chaucer names them in the General Prologue:

1 Knight	13 Man of Law	22 Doctor
2 Squire	14 Franklin	23 Wife of Bath
3 Yeman	15 Haberdasher	24 Parson
4 Prioress	16 Carpenter	25 Plowman
5 Second Nun	17 Webbe	26 Miller
6-8 Prestes three	18 Dyer	27 Manciple
9 Monk	19 Tapicer	28 Reve
10 Friar	20 Cook	29 Somnour
11 Merchant	21 Shipman	30 Pardoner
12 Clerk		

In the foregoing list I count three priests. Numerous attempts—none of them successful—have been made to emend line 164. Moreover, this is the reading of every MS of the *Canterbury Tales*. And the Ellesmere MS has a side-note: “¶ Nonne & iij. preestes.” Manly suggests that Chaucer wrote merely “That was hire chapeleyne,” leaving this line unfinished. “Who added *and preestes thre*,” he remarks, “no one knows.” The difficulty with this suggestion lies in the fact that these three words must have stood in the archetypal manuscript. Could they have been added without Chaucer’s knowledge and consent? Manly’s further statement that “it would be quite absurd to have three” ignores the evidence presented in 1873 by Furnivall from the 1537 Survey of the Abbey or Monastery of St. Mary, Winchester, of which Elizabeth Shelley was Abbess:

Our Survey of St. Mary’s shows that there were no less than five chaplains in the Monastery, who, I take it, from their titles of ‘Magister’ (the Confessor) and ‘Sir,’ must have been all priests.<sup>2</sup>

It is not necessary at this point to discuss this matter further since, whether we allow three priests or only one to the Prioress, the number of persons mentioned by Chaucer in the General Prologue will not square with the “nyne and twenty” of line 24. In one case we should have a company of thirty pilgrims in addition to the poet himself and in the other case only twenty-eight. The existence of this numerical discrepancy has been clearly recognized by Tatlock, who finds in it the basis for an interesting and wholly reasonable suggestion as to Chaucer’s method:

<sup>2</sup> *Essays on Chaucer*, Part III, Ch. Soc. 2nd Ser., p. 186. See also Skeat’s notes on the Prologue of the *Cant. Tales*. Speaking of the question of the three priests, Skeat declares: “The difficulty is, merely, how to reconcile this line with l. 24” (*Oxf. Chaucer*, v, 19).



This deficiency and the inconsistency between the "wel nyne and twenty" and the actual number of the pilgrims (31 including Chaucer) point to a change of plan at some time during the composition of the poem.<sup>3</sup>

The remainder of this paper will be devoted to an attempt to confirm the suggestion which Tatlock here puts forward by supplying definite evidence of one change in plan which can be detected in the General Prologue.

Wholly apart from the problem we have been discussing, there is strong reason for suspecting that Chaucer's description of the Squire was not written at the same time as his sketch of the other members of the Canterbury company, but was composed later and inserted in its present position between the descriptions of the Knight and the Yeman.

The campaigns in which the Knight had taken part (ll. 51-67) have been discussed in detail by Professor A. S. Cook in his paper, "The Historical Background of Chaucer's Knight."<sup>4</sup> The following is his summary of the Knight's adventures in the South:

His exploits were performed at Palátia, Satalia, and Ayas, on the eastern coast; at Alexandria, Tlemçen, and in Morocco, on the southern; and at Algeciras, where the Pillars of Hercules still said, *Ne plus ultra*. Thus the range of his crusading territory—to say nothing of Prussia, Lithuania, and Russia—was nearly 2300 miles from end to end. The period within which fall the historic exploits which Chaucer had in mind extends from 1343 to about 1367.

Chaucer's statement that the Knight "hadde the bord bigonne Aboven alle nacions in Pruce," as Professor Cook has shown, is a definite reference to the Teutonic table of honor, which was held, he finds, on five occasions only: 1377, 1385, 1391, 1392, and 1400.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *The Harl. MS 7334 and Revision of the Cant. Tales*, Ch. Soc. 2nd Ser. 41, p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, xx (1916), 161-240.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 209. Professor Cook's information in regard to the Prussian Ehrentisch seems to be much more accurate than Chaucer's, who says of the Knight

*Ful ofte tyme* he hadde the bord bigonne.

If Chaucer, as is generally believed, wrote the Prologue in 1387 there had been only *two* occurrences of the table of honor before that date.

It is not necessary to digress into a discussion of Professor Cook's

Aside from the campaigns in Baltic countries, the Knight's adventures were located in Spain, Morocco, and the Levant and range in date from 1343 to 1367. The Squire, who was a youth of twenty, could not of course have participated in any of these campaigns, but he might at least have accompanied his father on his expeditions to Prussia, Lithuania, and Russia, from which, according to Professor Cook, the Knight had just returned. But there is no hint of this in Chaucer's account of the Squire, although "he carf biforn his fader at the table." In fact, the exploits of the Squire do not overlap at any point with those of the Knight:

he hadde been somtyme in chyvachie  
In Flaundres, in Artoys, and Pycardie;  
And born hym wel, as of so litel space.

Chaucer himself in the campaign of 1359-60—his only experience in military service—had marched through Artois and Picardy, and it has been suggested that the reference is to that campaign. But to read autobiographical reminiscence into these lines involves obvious difficulties. In the first place, the Squire is complimented for his valor, whereas Chaucer, so far as we know, won no laurels in the field but was soon taken prisoner. Again, the geographical details, Tatlock objects, do not agree inasmuch as the campaign of 1359-60 did not take place in Flanders at all.

Tatlock, on the other hand, believes Chaucer refers to the invasion of Flanders and Picardy in 1383 by the military expedition under the Bishop of Norwich:

I find in Walsingham no record whatever of an English campaign in Flanders between 1359 and 1383, or between 1383 and 1395. But in 1383 there was one which exactly fits the conditions . . . at any rate everything here fits with great nicety the strikingly circumstantial account given by Chaucer. The Squire had been on a "chivachye" which had not lasted long (v. 87) in exactly the region which had been covered by the Bishop of Norwich's expedition, and which had not been the scene of such events for a generation or more.<sup>7</sup>

attempt to identify Chaucer's Knight as a composite of Henry of Lancaster (†1361) and Henry Earl of Derby, afterwards Henry IV, who in April 1387 lacked a little over a month of attaining his majority.

<sup>6</sup> Froissart constantly uses in his account the verb *chevaucher*. The campaign hardly outlasted the summer.

<sup>7</sup> *Development and Chronol. of Chaucer's Works*, pp. 147, 148.

This suggestion that Chaucer was referring to historical events in 1383, though more plausible than any other, still leaves the Squire oddly dissociated both in time and place from the military excursions of the Knight.

Still more remarkable is the fact that, although Chaucer in describing the Knight makes no mention of any servant or attendant, he concludes his description of the Squire with the remark:

A Yeman hadde he, and servaunts namo  
At that tyme, for him liste ryde so.

In telling of the "array" of the Knight, Chaucer said "His hors were goode"; and Skeat calls attention to the fact that "hors" is here a plural form. Did he groom his horses himself or did this fall to the Squire, who rode "embrouded as it were a meede Al ful of fresshe floures, whyte and reede?" Surely, if it was a matter for comment that the Squire travelled with only a single yeoman attending him, this would have been still more surprising in the case of the Knight.

This peculiar situation is perfectly explained if we assume that the couplet in which the Yeman is mentioned originally formed the conclusion of the description of the Knight, and accordingly that in the phrase "A Yeman hadde he" the pronoun refers to the Knight instead of the Squire. If we read ll. 101-2 directly following l. 78 it will be seen, not only that the connection is perfect, but that the remark on the absence of other servants is quite in keeping with the description of the Knight's personal appearance with habergeon "al bismotered." And the statement "At that tyme . . . him liste ryde so" is at once explicable when understood as referring to the special circumstances under which the Knight was travelling to Canterbury:

For he was late y-come from his viage  
And wente for to doon his pilgrimage.

On the other hand, that a gay young blade like the Squire, who was not averse to displaying himself to advantage, should have *listed* to ride on this occasion without his customary entourage is hardly what we should expect.

Reverting now to the discussion in the former section of the present paper, we observe that the conclusions there reached, and

the inference now drawn that the lines on the Squire are a subsequent insertion, although proceeding from wholly independent lines of evidence, are mutually confirmatory:

(1) The number in the Canterbury company as stated by Chaucer in line 24 is twenty-nine, while the actual count of the pilgrims introduced in the Prologue shows thirty persons.

(2) The text of Chaucer's description of the Squire affords unmistakable evidence that it was inserted later, so that *according to his original plan* there would be exactly twenty-nine pilgrims. That Chaucer in adding the figure of the Squire should have neglected to alter his total, will surprise no one who has observed his methods in similar cases.

Incidentally, I may note that this view lends additional support to the reading "prestes thre," which occurs in all the MSS. For unless we count the priests as three the original number in the Canterbury company, with the Squire now omitted, would be reduced to twenty-seven. It is true that in the body of the *Canterbury Tales* Chaucer mentions only one Nun's Priest, but this, it would appear, is merely another instance of a later change in the working out of the poet's plans. The more the text is studied the more evidence is disclosed that Chaucer in carrying into execution his plan of the *Canterbury Tales* introduced numerous alterations and in some cases even rearranged his materials with a free hand.

CARLETON BROWN

*New York University*

---

#### A LINE IN THE REEVE'S PROLOGUE

In a recent article<sup>1</sup> Mr. Franz Montgomery suggests that line 3912 of the Prologue of the Reeve's Tale deserves further comment because the Reeve is there quoting a well-known maxim of the law of England. The line runs:

For lefeful is with force force of-showve.

The *Elismere MS* contains the marginal gloss: vim vi repellere.

Mr. Montgomery says: 'The *Digesta* of Justinian, which was

<sup>1</sup> 'A Note on the Reeve's Prologue,' *Philological Quarterly*, x (1931), 404-05.

certainly known and was probably used as a text-book on law in Chaucer's time, states the principle in almost the words of the Reeve (Paulus, ix, 2, 45, 4): 'Qui cum aliter tueri se non possit,<sup>2</sup> damni culpam dederint, innoxii sunt: vim enim vi defendere omnes leges omniaque iura permittunt.' Later<sup>3</sup> he says: 'The tracing of this legal doctrine to a work which Chaucer would surely have studied had he been a student at the Temple seems at first to add weight to Professor Rickert's theory, but a further consideration of the problem indicates that this use of a widely known quotation from the law of the land throws no light upon Chaucer's legal training. In the first place, the Reeve . . . would certainly be expected to know the common laws of trespass.'

It is not quite clear how the Reeve could have known even the commonest laws of trespass unless Chaucer himself had first acquired the knowledge, either at the Inner Temple or elsewhere. But that Chaucer found the maxim in the *Digesta*, which 'was probably used as a textbook,' and which 'he would surely have studied had he been a student at the Temple,' is very dubious. According to Pollock and Maitland:<sup>4</sup> ' . . . in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. . . . The king's justices, the practitioners in the king's courts, are in all probability profoundly ignorant of the *Digest* and the *Decretals*.'

There are, however, many other possible sources. I shall list those that I have found in chronological order:

1. The phrase 'vim vi repellere' is quoted by the Forcellini<sup>5</sup> dictionary as coming from Cicero's oration for Sestius (56 B. C.) (17, 39). The passage cited, after describing the nature and habits of the opposition with some force, runs: 'non verebar, ne quis aut vim vi repulsam reprehenderet, aut perditorum . . . mortem moereret.' In modern texts the phrase as there used is read 'vim vi depulsam'; but 'repulsam' is the older reading, found in a great many manuscripts, and printed as late as 1830 in

<sup>2</sup> I do not know Mr. Montgomery's authority for this form. The best reading seems to be 'possent.'

<sup>3</sup> Referring to Miss Rickert's paper, 'Was Chaucer a Student at the Inner Temple,' in *The Manly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923).

<sup>4</sup> Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1895), i, 132.

<sup>5</sup> E. Forcellini, *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, consilio et cura J. Facciolati (Eng. Trans. J. Bailey, London, 1828).

the Delphini<sup>6</sup> Edition. The exact phrase 'vim vi repellere' is found in the Bobbio scholia to this Ciceronian passage, and its use there indicates that the Ciceronian reference was familiarly quoted as containing the expression in question.<sup>7</sup>

2. In the *Digest*<sup>8</sup> (A. D. 533) there occurs, besides the passage already mentioned, the statement: 'Vim vi repellere licere, Cassius scribit' (XLIII, XVI, 1, 27).

3. In the *Speculum Ecclesiae* of Gerald de Barri<sup>9</sup> (ca. 1220) we find 'per legem denique Walensicam . . . vim vi repellere parans.'<sup>10</sup>

4. In the Decretals<sup>11</sup> of Gregory IX (1234) (v, 12, 18) we are told of a case where the doctrine does not apply, 'quam-vis vim vi repellere omnes leges et omnia iura permittant: quia tamen id debet fieri cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae, non ad sumendam vindictam, sed ad iniuriam propulsandam.'<sup>12</sup>

5. In the *Liber Consolationis et Consilii*<sup>13</sup> (1246) of Albertano of Brescia the phrase 'vim vi repellere' occurs three times. The first passage, 'etiam a legibus permittitur vim vi repellere' (p. 96, l. 5) is paraphrased in Jean de Meung's translation,<sup>14</sup> which Chaucer followed in the Tale of Melibeus. The third, 'Vim vi repellere omnes leges omniaque iura permittunt' (p. 110, l. 18), is

<sup>6</sup> *Marci Tullii Ciceronis Opera* (20 vols., London, 1830), XII, 2014.

<sup>7</sup> Professor Max Radin of the University of California School of Jurisprudence has kindly pointed out to me the information in this paragraph.

<sup>8</sup> *Corpus Iuris Civilis* (ed. J. L. G. Beck, Leipzig, 1829).

<sup>9</sup> *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* (Rolls Series, 8 vols., London, 1879-91), IV, 133.

<sup>10</sup> However, I can find no trace of the doctrine in A. Owen's *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (London, 1841).

<sup>11</sup> *Corpus Iuris Canonici* (ed. E. Friedberg, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1881).

<sup>12</sup> This passage is interesting as being the apparent source of Coke's sentence, which is cited by modern legal dictionaries as the source of 'vim vi repellere.' Coke has: 'Vim vi repellere licet, modo fiat moderamine inculpatae tutelae, non ad sumendam vindictam, sed ad propulsandam iniuriam.' Sir Edward Coke, *First Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England, or, A Commentary upon Littleton* (1st Am. ed., Philadelphia, 1853), fol. 162a.

<sup>13</sup> Edited by T. Sundby for the Chaucer Society (2nd series, vol. VIII, London, 1873).

<sup>14</sup> 'Histoire de Mellibée' in *Le Menagier de Paris* (ed. Société des Bibliophiles Français, 2 vols., Paris, 1846), I, 220.

omitted. But the second, 'Quod autem dixisti, leges concedere vim vi repellere' (p. 96, l. 24), is translated fairly literally by Jean de Meung, and appears in the Tale of Meliboeus (l. 2722) as 'And if ye seye, that right axeth a man to defenden violence by violence.' The possibility that Chaucer's manuscript of the French version was glossed with the Latin phrase is very attractive.

6. In Bracton<sup>15</sup> (d. 1268) we find: 'Incontinenti vim vi repellere est, quā citò sciri possit vim esse illatam, priusquam ille cui illata fuerit, ad actum contrarium divertat.'

7. In *Fleta*<sup>16</sup> (ca. 1290) this sentence is rearranged as follows: 'In continenti autem vim si [sc. vi] repellere licitum est, vel quam cito sciri possit vim esse illatam, priusquam ille cui illata fuerit ad actū contrariū divertat. . . .' The 'si' for 'vi' is obviously one of the misprints in which the book abounds.

It is worth remarking that in spite of the Roman assurance that 'Vim vi repellere omnes leges omniaque iura permittunt' the doctrine has never been fully adopted in English law. There seems to be no trace of it in the Anglo-Saxon codes or the first Norman laws.<sup>17</sup> It is not in Glanvil.<sup>18</sup> The phrase may appear in the *Year Books*, but it is not among the maxims indexed in the volumes in the *Rolls Series* and in the publications of the Selden Society. The sentence quoted from Bracton and *Fleta* is an explanation of the restrictions hedging the doctrine rather than a statement of the doctrine itself. This sentence does not occur in *Britton*.<sup>19</sup> I have not found the phrase elsewhere in Bracton, and Guterbock,<sup>20</sup> listing the quotations from Justinian in Bracton, does not include it. It does not seem to be in Littleton<sup>21</sup>—certainly not in the chapter

<sup>15</sup> Sir H. de Bracton, *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliae* (Rolls Series, 6 vols., London, 1878-83), fol. 162.

<sup>16</sup> *Fleta, seu commentarius iuris anglicani sic nuncupatus* (2nd ed., London, 1685), p. 215.

<sup>17</sup> F. Liebermann, *Die gesetze der Angelsachsen* (3 vols., Halle, 1903).

<sup>18</sup> R. de Glanville, *De legibus et consuetudinibus regni Angliae* (ed. G. E. Woodbine, New Haven, 1932).

<sup>19</sup> *Britton* (ed. F. M. Nichols, 2 vols., Oxford, 1865). (ca. 1291. Like *Fleta*, a condensation of Bracton.)

<sup>20</sup> C. Güterbock, *Henricus de Bracton und sein Verhältniss zum römischen Recht* (trans. B. Coxe, *Bracton and His Relation to Roman Law*, Philadelphia, 1866), p. 50.

<sup>21</sup> [Sir Thomas] Littleton's *Tenures, in French and English* (London, 1671).

upon which Coke comments when using it. Furthermore, it is not merely a question of verbal omission. The very spirit of English law—particularly during the Middle Ages—has been opposed to self help.<sup>22</sup>

LOUIS MCCORRY MYERS

Berkeley, California

### AN APPETITE FOR FORM

In *The Legend of Good Women* Chaucer writes:

As matere appetyteth forme al-vey,  
And from forme in-to forme hit passen may. . . . 1582-3.

And:

Thou giver of the formes, that hast wrought  
The faire world, and bare hit in thy thought  
Eternally, or thou thy werk began. . . . 2228-30.

About the first of these passages Skeat remarks:

'As matter always seeks to have a definite form, and may pass from one form into another.' Mr. Archer Hind refers me to Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, A. viii 1072 b. 3: *κινεῖ δὲ ὡς ἐρώμενον, κινούμενον δὲ τὰλλα κινεῖ*. Bech shows that this is all from Guido, who has: 'Scimus enim mulieris animum semper uirum appetere, sicut appetit materia semper formam. . . . Sed sicut ad formam de forma procedere materium notum est, sic mulieris concupiscentia dissoluta procedere de uiro ad uirum . . . sine fine, cum sit quaedam profunditas sine fundo,' etc.<sup>1</sup>

About the second:

Corson has the following note: 'In these verses (2228-30) the Platonic doctrine of forms or ideas is expressed. For whatever knowledge Chaucer may have had of the philosophy of Plato, he was probably indebted to the Italian poets, with whom, especially Petrarch, Plato was a favorite.' Corson also quotes the following from Sir Wm. Hamilton: 'Plato agreed with the rest of the ancient philosophers in this—that all things were made, existed from eternity, without form; but he likewise believed that there are external *forms* of all possible things that exist, without matter;

<sup>22</sup> Pollock and Maitland, II, 574: 'So fierce is it [English law of the thirteenth century] against self help that it can hardly be induced to find a place even for self defense. The man who has slain another in self defence deserves, it is true, but he also needs a royal pardon.' Cf. *ibid.*, II, 479 and II, 537; also Bracton, fol. 134b.

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Skeat, *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1894, III, 328-9.



and to these external and immaterial forms he gave the name of ideas. In the Platonic sense, then, ideas were the patterns to which the Deity fashioned the phenomenal or ectypal world. . . .'

However Chaucer here follows Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, lib. iii. met. 9:

. . . Tu cuncta superno  
ducis ab exemplo, pulcrum pulcerrimus ipse  
mundum mente gerens, similique in imagine formans.<sup>2</sup>

In regard to the suggestion Mr. Hind seems to make, it is only to be remarked that if Chaucer could not read Plato he could hardly read any other Greek.<sup>3</sup> It would not have been necessary, moreover, inasmuch as Aristotle was so widely known and respected after the rediscovery of him in the twelfth century, that the poet could have picked up the hylomorphic theory from any one of numerous sources.<sup>4</sup> But not from Guido would he get, though he got the expression there, explanation as to why matter should so "appetyte" form. Would he not have been curious about it?

The Stoics, undertaking to explain Nature, conceived of an all-directing law which, in its capacity of creating natural forms, they called the *logos spermatikos*. Out of primary fire, as from a seed, this *logos spermatikos* produced, and gave life and form to, all things; it was at once the material *germ* of things, and the law determining their shapes and qualities.<sup>5</sup> The Neo-Platonists, while adopting the term, gave it a somewhat different meaning. According to Plotinus there came a series of emanations from the fundamental reality, the Ineffable, and the last emanation possessing spiritual existence, Nature or the World Body, received from the World Soul, just above it in the hierarchy, creative powers, *logoi spermatikoi*, which it cast upon the inert, Matter.<sup>6</sup> Later Augustine,

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 340-1.

<sup>3</sup> Though lines 1582-3 might almost be based directly on Aristotle: "The final cause, then, produces motion by being loved, and by that which it moves, it moves all other things. Now if something is moved it is capable of being otherwise than as it is." Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, trans. under ed. of J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1908, A. vii 1072 b. 3.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, A. Weber and R. B. Perry, *History of Philosophy*, New York, Scribner's, 1925, 185 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See E. Zeller, *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, trans. O. J. Reichel, New York, 1892, 165-73.

<sup>6</sup> See W. R. Inge, *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, London, 1926, I, 155 ff.

using certain elements taken from each theory and altering them as his theology required, evolved his Exemplarism. God's knowledge of his essence, according to this, makes it possible for him to visualize weak resemblances of his essence which are all possible finite essences; these exist in God, therefore, before assuming material existence. They have existed eternally. When God created the world he made first prime matter, and inspired it with germs representing the finite essences corresponding to the *exemplars* in his mind.<sup>7</sup>

Omnium quippe rerum quae corporaliter visibilibusque nascuntur, occulta quaedam semina in istis corporeis mundi hujus elementis latent. . . . Invisibilium enim seminum creator, ipse creator est omnium rerum; quoniam quaecumque nascendo ad oculos nostros exeunt, ex occultis seminibus accipiunt progrediendi primordia, et incrementa debita magnitudinis distinctionesque formarum ab originalibus tanquam regulis sumunt.<sup>8</sup>

Here, in this Augustinian version of the concept of form-in-matter, was the whole business in a language Chaucer could read,—whether or not he actually did so—and here was an explanation of matter's appetite; for matter apparently should desire form if it holds the germs of form within it. Chaucer certainly knew Augustine, whether at first hand or at second,<sup>9</sup> and it appears likely that a man of the poet's evident intellectual curiosity (shown by his large library and his rather frequent allusions to his much reading) would have referred as far back as he could toward the source of an important metaphysical theory, to find an explanation without which Guido's statement could seem only arbitrary and puzzling.

Also, Skeat's quoted passage from Boethius does not seem to mention forms, and it is not obvious why Chaucer should have done so, if he indeed were paralleling Boethius closely. But God, in inspiring or impregnating prime matter with the germs of all created things, might very naturally be said to be "giving forms." The expression is clear, and the poet's reason for using it clear, if regarded in relation to this Augustinian metaphysic.

<sup>7</sup> See Maurice De Wulf, *The History of Mediaeval Philosophy*, I, 118 ff. Also W. C. Curry, "Tumbling Nature's Germens," *SP.*, XXIX (1932), 15 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Augustine, *De Trinitate*, III, viii, 3 (in *Opera Omnia*, Castigata, etc., Monachorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti (Parisiis, 1873), VII, col. 1229).

<sup>9</sup> See T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer, His Life and Writings*, New York, Harper's, 1892, II, 297-99. Also note Chaucer's references to Augustine, as in *L. G. W.*, 1690; *Canterbury Tales A*, 187 ff.; *B*, 4431 ff.

Thus it appears likely, considering Chaucer's familiarity with the doctrines of Augustine on the one hand, and his probable depth of intellect on the other, that we must conclude his conception of the nature of reality, as shown in the passages quoted at the beginning of this note, depended not essentially on either Aristotle or Plato, or the Stoics or Neo-Platonists, though elements of the Greeks are diffused through it, nor on the summaries of Guido and Boethius—which, as I observed of the first, standing alone could appear only arbitrary and puzzling—but on the philosopher who used the Greeks and was in turn used by later men: Augustine.

W. R. MOSES

*Vanderbilt University*

#### CHAUCER'S MERCHANT'S TALE AND A RUSSIAN LEGEND OF KING SOLOMON

In the Oriental analogues of Chaucer's *Merchant's Tale* which are published in the *Originals and Analogues* of the Chaucer Society, the deceived husband is quite able to see his wife's infidelity, but is convinced by her that the whole affair was unreal—a magic illusion. In the Western group published in the same volume there are two tales which follow this formula: the *Comoedia Lydiae* of Matthieu of Vendôme, and Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, vii, 9. In the other three Western stories (the fable by Alphonsus, the Latin story published by Thomas Wright, and Caxton's *Fable of a blynd Man and his Wyf*), the husband is blind, but his sight is restored to him at the moment of his wife's union with her lover in the tree. This "Western" form of the story (to use a convenient adjective) is the one followed by Chaucer.

It would be idle to multiply analogues in one group or the other merely for the sake of proving their popularity. But there is one variant of the Western group which deserves special attention because of its geographical and literary setting. So far as I know, it has not been quoted in connection with the *Merchant's Tale*, except by its Russian editor. I refer to one of the Russian medieval legends about King Solomon: *The Merchant of Jerusalem*. Like other Russian ballads and folk tales dealing with King Solomon,<sup>1</sup> it

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of these, see Alfred Rambaud, *La Russie épique*, Paris, 1876, pp. 384 ff.

represents a curious combination of non-Biblical story with Biblical characters. Under Moslem and Judaic influence, popular Slavic tradition tended to substitute King Solomon for any wise personage of popular literature who is skilled in solving riddles or in foretelling the future. His part in the following story is, however, very small.<sup>2</sup>

In the town of Jerusalem a blind merchant had a garden.  
 Into this garden walked the blind merchant  
 Together with his lawful wife.  
 His loving wife said to him:  
 "O thou my husband, beloved one,  
 In our very fair garden  
 There are tidings now manifest:  
 Apples have grown on our tree."  
 And from her pocket she gave him an apple.  
 When the merchant had eaten that apple,  
 Himself he spoke these words:  
 "Where, my wife, didst thou take these apples?"  
 His loving wife said to him,  
 "There are still more of these apples,  
 But 'tis high up that they hang.  
 Do thou hold on to the tree with thy hands,  
 And I shall mount into that high tree  
 And pluck thee some apples."  
 On that tree she had a cradle,  
 And in the cradle was her lover,  
 Beside him she laid herself in the cradle.

Now at that very same time  
 Tsar David perchance stood on his balcony  
 Together with his very fair Tsaritsa;  
 They saw the blind man holding the tree,  
 And Tsar David spoke with the Tsaritsa:  
 "If at this time God gave sight to the blind man,  
 What then would he do with his wife?"  
 The very fair Tsaritsa replies:  
 "My sister would find a way out!"  
 But the son in her womb [i. e., Solomon] cried: "Woman  
     here judges in woman's manner!"  
 The mother spoke: "Poison will I drink,  
 And thee in my womb I will ruin."  
 And the son replied, "I will break through thy flank,  
 I will break thy rib, and thus come out!"

---

<sup>2</sup>The text is printed by A. Veselovskii: *Slavyanskiya Skazaniya o Solomone i Kitrovase i Zapadnyya Legendy o Morol'fe i Merline*, St. Petersburg, 1872, pp. 102 f.

Then God gave the blind man his sight, so that he saw his wife with her lover in the cradle, and he cried out: "O thou wife, thou fool! How canst thou commit adultery over my very head?" His wife said, "Only suffer me to come to thee, for I am entirely thine. Do thou beat me, do thou break me, but only hearken to what I tell thee: at night I slept and I dreamed in my sleep that if I should commit adultery over thy head, God would give thee thy sight." Then the husband took his wife by the right hand and kissed her, and they went home.

Thereupon the Tsar said, "Wherefore hath that man done nothing with his wife? He hath nought to do with his eyes!" For two steps he saw, and no more.—

That this version is corrupt or ill-remembered is indicated by the change from verse to prose; but that the original goes back to medieval times is likely because of the antiquity of other ballads concerning Solomon, which resemble this one in language and style. One of these, concerning Solomon and Kitrovas, is a close parallel to the Middle High German *Salomon und Markolf*.<sup>3</sup> Both the Russian and German accounts probably came from a Byzantine romance, which in its turn drew on Talmudic sources. Byzantium seems to have been the intermediary between Russia and the Orient for more than one borrowed tale, and the *fabliau* of the apple-tree probably followed the same route. It is also possible that Byzantium was the intermediary between the Orient and Western Europe.

Tsar David, his wife, and the unborn Solomon, who discuss woman's guile, are not needed in the story, since other versions in the Western group represent the husband as obtaining his sight in direct reply to his prayer to Jupiter. But Chaucer also introduces a discussion on matrimony between Pluto and Proserpine at precisely this point. There are other characteristic details common to the Russian and Chaucerian versions: in both, the husband's sight is restored—not in response to his own prayer—but because a third person with supernatural powers wishes to experiment on him; in both, the husband himself helps his wife to climb into the tree; in both, there is reference to Solomon's opinion of woman's guile which is not essential to the plot. These corre-

<sup>3</sup> See Fr. Vogt, *Die deutschen Dichtungen von Salomon und Markolf*, Halle, 1880. The relation of Byzantine, Slavic, and Germanic versions is discussed on p. lviii. See also L. A. Magnus, *The Heroic Ballads of Russia*, London, 1921, pp. 151 ff.

spondences indicate that Chaucer knew some form of the tale, possibly in French, which was closer to his own than any of the Western analogues thus far quoted. It is probably an accident, however, that the blind husband in the Russian tale and the narrator of Chaucer's are both merchants.<sup>4</sup>

MARGARET SCHLAUCH

*New York University*

# A NOTE ON *SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT* 2035

Swyþe sweþled vmbe his swange swetely þat knyȝt  
þe gordel of þe grene silke, þat gay wel bisemed,  
Vpon þat ryol red cloþe þat ryche watȝ to schewe. Ll. 2034-6.

Professors Tolkien and Gordon in their useful edition of the poem (Oxford, 1930 corrected impression) parse *gay* as the substantival adjective. So parsed, the phrase 'gay(one)' can refer only to Gawain, and lines 2034-2036, which describe his actions, would run (with changed word-order): 'that knight with pleasure, wrapped closely round his loins the girdle of the green silk, that gay(one) it well suited, upon the royal red cloth' [of the surcoat].

Now while it is true that frequent use of the adjective as noun is a characteristic of the style of our author,<sup>1</sup> and also true that some of his lines are quite obscure because of the ellipsis of some word or expression deemed necessary by modern grammarians, yet the second half-line of 2035 would seem to belong in sense to the following line rather than to the preceding phrase *þe gordel of þe grene silke*. The author would have us understand, not so much that the girdle suited Gawain, but that it matched well the colour of the surcoat: green on red.

<sup>4</sup> Veselovskii, whose brilliant and learned work on the legends of Solomon, Morolf, and Merlin deserves to be better known by Western scholars, mentioned the similarity between the *Merchant's Tale* and the *Merchant of Jerusalem* as early as 1872 (*op. cit.*, p. 103). He also mentioned the Latin story printed by Thomas Wright, the *Decamerone*, and the *Comœdia Lydiæ*. A fifth reference, to the *fabliau Dou viliens qui vit un autre hom od sa fame*, is misleading. The story (B. Roquefort, *Poésies de Marie de France*, Paris, 1832, II, 206-08) is not a true analogue of those we are considering.

<sup>1</sup> See Schmittbetz, 'Das Adjectiv im Verse v. Syr G.', *Anglia* 32, pp. 1, 163, 359.

Instead of being a substantive, however, *gay* may be parsed in either one of two ways, as adjective or as adverb.

Parsed as an adjective, it is qualified by the adverb *wel* (*NED.*, s. v. *well*, adv. iv, 16) whose sense varies from 'fully, completely' to 'fairly, considerably, rather.' The meaning of lines 2035-2036 would then be: 'the girdle of the green silk that rather gay looked (appeared) on the royal red cloth.' *Bisemed* should be given its intrans. meaning (which it may take in the 3rd. person), 'seems, appear, look,' and not the intrans. impersonal 'it suited.'

But the objection to this adjectival use of *gay* is that it precedes rather than follows its qualifying adverb, whereas the usual word order in ME. is *wel* (adv.) + adjective. All of the examples given in *NED.* (s. v. *well*, adv. iv, 16, 16b, 17) follow this usual word order, as it appears, for instance, in *Piers Plow.* A. vii, 44, 'in a wel perilous place.' It is barely possible that metrical reasons induced the poet to vary normal word order, but it is difficult to see why, for even if one transposes the word order from *gay wel* to *wel gay*, the line fits perfectly into one of the classes which the school of Sievers has set up (two strong stresses to the ME. allit. half-line), and equally well into one of the classes set up by the school of Kaluza (three (or four) stresses to the second half-line of ME. allit. poetry).<sup>2</sup>

It would seem best, then, to parse *gay* not as adjective, but as adverb. As an adverb it would have the meanings given in *EDD.*, 13, 'very, rather, pretty,' that are found today in the dialects of

<sup>2</sup> If one scans the second half-line of 2035 as a line with two strong stresses, it is an A type 'mit einsilbigem Auftakt,'  $X \angle XX \angle X$ ; with the two words transposed it is a BC type,  $XX \angle X \angle X$  (cf. J. Thomas, *Die Allit. Langzeile des Gawayn-Dichters*, Coburg, 1908, pp. 43-44, 47). If one assumes three stresses to the half-line, B. Kuhnke (*Die Allit. Langzeile in der ME. Romanze Sir Gaw. and the Gr. Kt.*, Berlin, 1900, p. 77) tells us that 2035b is to be scanned as an A type 'mit Auftakt,'  $X \angle \grave{X} \angle \grave{X}$ . With *gay* and *wel* transposed, it still remains, according to Kuhnke, an A type; see his scansion of 1389b

$x \angle \grave{x} \angle \grave{x}$        $x \angle \grave{x}$   
And kysses hym as comlyly / as he coupe awyse

where the first strong stress does not fall upon the allit. syllable. All the types mentioned in this note are those which scholars find peculiar to or characteristic of the second half of a ME. allit. line.

Derbyshire, Yorkshire, and Lancashire (cf. Mod. Scottish 'gey weel').<sup>3</sup>

At first thought one might question this use of *gay* because it does not appear very frequently in M.E. writings (the earliest quot. in *NED.* is dated 1686), but it should be remembered that this poem contains not a few dialectal expressions that would not appear in other M.E. works. In this connection I cannot do better than quote from Professor Tolkien himself. In a foreword to W. E. Haigh's *Dialect of the Huddersfield Dist.* (Oxford, 1928), p. xvi, he says:

Indeed, such books as this one sometimes throw valuable light on the meanings or forms of words in these old poems, such poems as the romance *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, the beautiful elegiac sermon known as the *Pearl*, the long fragments of the *Wars of Alexander*.

And further along (p. xvii) he shows by a particular example how the folk-speech has persisted in the very poem we discuss:

The amusing entry under *ænt(nont)* may be noted both in this connexion and as a good illustration of the reaction of literary and dialectal English in an area still possessing a very individual local form of speech. Though *thi nont Sally* may now seem homely and less polite, in the fourteenth century a courtly poet allows a noble lord to beg Sir Gawain . . . to return to his house where Morgan le Fay is living, with the words *therefore I ethe* (implore) *the . . . to come to thy naunt*.

The homely survivals in dialect are often of ancient lineage, and not the chance mutilations of literary English by the unlettered.

Adverbial *gay* would render unnecessary the comma at the end of 2035, and we should read 'the girdle of the green silk that looked rather well upon the royal red cloth.'

HENRY L. SAVAGE

*Princeton University*

---

<sup>3</sup> See quotations in *EDD.* It is worthy of remark that one quot. is from NE. Lancs. In view of J. P. Oakden's surmise that the *Gawain*-poet may have been connected with the castle of Clitheroe, that fact is interesting, but further comment in our present state of knowledge would be dangerous. See Oakden's book, *Allit. Poetry in Middle English*, Manchester, 1930.



A XIII<sup>th</sup> CENTURY *OURE FADER* IN A PAVIA MS.

Much of the detail of the wanderings of manuscripts of the later Middle Ages we shall never know. Few owners have left any trace of their possession in the MSS. themselves. But we know enough about the differences between the characteristic scripts of various parts of Europe in, say, the thirteenth century, to be able, in many cases, to piece together an interesting story. An instance of this is a codex in the Biblioteca Universitaria of Pavia. MS. 69 of this library is written on vellum, measuring at the present time 6 by 8 inches, in seven easily distinguishable hands of the middle of the thirteenth century. There are marginal notes in at least four more hands. Two of the marginal hands are English, both of the second half of the thirteenth century. The remaining two are clearly Italian, both later, the first about the end of the century and the second about a century later, *ca.* 1400. We have therefore a record of a great diversity of original scribes, about which more anon, of at least two subsequent English owners who were interested enough in the subject matter to make marginal comments and glosses on the text, of the removal to Italy, either in the possession of a wandering English student or a returning Italian, and of another, much later, Italian owner and annotator. Since about 1400 it has remained largely undisturbed, to judge from the absence of fifteenth-century annotations. It is almost certain that the seven different text hands were of the same scriptorium and worked at the copying of the codex in turn. The hand that has written ff. 34-46 appears again later ff. 67-84. At the foot of the verso of the last folium of the first quire written by this scribe (f. 46<sup>b</sup>) appears the *custos* of the next gathering: *Dominus virtutum*, which are the initial words of the next treatise, written by another hand. The earlier scribe, knowing the order in which the treatises were to appear, perhaps even expecting to begin the copying of the next work himself, thus finished off his last gathering.

In spite of the fact that the text hands are different enough from each other to be easily distinguishable, they all have certain characteristics in common which immediately suggest the script prevalent in the eastern central part of England, from Cambridge to Lincoln, around the middle part of the thirteenth century. The contents furthermore bear out this suggestion.

The codex contains: (1) ff. 1<sup>A</sup>-19<sup>A</sup>, an *Encheridion Penitentis*,<sup>1</sup> which, according to the rubric, is compounded from the *Summa Reymundi* and from divers works of William of Autun, Robert Grosseteste, Richard of Leicester and *cuiusdam doctoris parisiensis* (probably Guillelmus Parisiensis); (2) ff. 19<sup>A</sup>-24<sup>D</sup>, miscellaneous *Meditaciones Bernardi*; (3) ff. 25<sup>A</sup>-33<sup>b</sup>, the *Templum Dei* of Robert Grosseteste; (4) ff. 34<sup>A</sup>-46<sup>D</sup>, the *Qui bene presunt presbiteri*, often ascribed to Guillelmus de Montibus († 1213); (5) ff. 47<sup>A</sup>-66<sup>D</sup>, a *Tractatus de Virtutibus et Viciis*,<sup>2</sup> here described in the earlier (XIII exeuntis) Italian hand as a work *venerabilis domini lincolniensis*; (6) ff. 67<sup>A</sup>-84<sup>C</sup>, a treatise *De Preceptis*, ascribed in the *contenta* on the back cover of the codex, in the hand of the earlier Italian owner, to Grosseteste; (7) ff. 85<sup>a</sup>-88<sup>b</sup>, an otherwise unknown sermon of Grosseteste beginning: *Restat agere de luxuria* . . .; ff. 89-91 are blank; (8) ff. 92<sup>a</sup>-95<sup>b</sup>, a *Canon Misse*, wrongly ascribed in the *contenta* to Grosseteste;<sup>3</sup> (9) ff. 97<sup>A</sup>-106<sup>b</sup>, a *Canon Misse Innocencii III*, incomplete.

Not the least interesting feature of this MS. is a thirteenth-century English Lord's Prayer, written in neat small chancery hand probably closely contemporary with the text, in the lower margin of f. 41<sup>b</sup>. Two hands have been at work on its composition, the second certainly contemporary, to add a phrase or complete a line. In the appended transcription parentheses enclose the corrector's additions.

Oracio dominica in materna lingua

fader þat hart in heuene blessed be þi name  
 To þi kyndedom mote (we) comen. (scildes alle fro scame)  
 þi wille be don in herþe as it is in heuene  
 þif ous to day houre echedaȝes bred (for þif ous þe sennes seuene)  
 for þif ous oure dettes as we don our (dettures)  
 lad ous into no fonding bote into gode moures. (Amen).

<sup>1</sup> This treatise is found in Pembroke Coll., Cambridge, MS. 87, ff. 1<sup>a</sup>-16<sup>b</sup>. See *Catalogue of Manuscripts of Pembroke College*, by M. R. James (Cambridge, 1905), p. 78. This codex came from Bury St. Edmunds.

<sup>2</sup> I shall have occasion to treat the question of the authenticity of this and the two following tractates at some length in a forthcoming catalogue of the works of Grosseteste. There seems no reason, external or internal, to doubt the value of the early ascriptions.

<sup>3</sup> This work, beginning: *In virtute sancte crucis* . . . exists in several other early XIIIth century English MSS., e. g. in Cambridge Univ. Ll. i. 15, ff. 188<sup>b</sup>-192<sup>d</sup>, and in Bodleian Rawlinson A. 384 ff. 93<sup>a</sup>-97<sup>a</sup>, where it is

This excursion into the vernacular is obviously prompted by the discussion of the *Pater Noster* in the text, beginning on f. 39<sup>D</sup>.

This is not the only bit of English in the codex. Tractate (5), *De Virtutibus et Viciis*, ascribed to Grosseteste, contains, ff. 64<sup>A</sup>-65<sup>D</sup>, a discussion of "Matrimonium." The explanation of the grades of consanguinity seemed to Grosseteste to demand the use of vernacular terms. At the bottom of f. 64<sup>B</sup> the text reads:

accidit triplex vinculum dissolvens matrimonium: unum inter parentes baptizatorum quod dici potest compaternitas (64<sup>C</sup>) vel commaternitas wlgo *godsibrede and godmodrede*; aliud inter suscipientes et susceptos quod dici potest compaternitas vel commaternitas respectu suscipiencium wlgo *god-fader and godmoder*, respectu susceptorum confiliiolitas wlgo *godsons and goddouter*; tercium est inter pueros consimul susceptos quod potest dici confraternitas et consororinitas wlgo *godbrother and godsuster*. Susceptus enim in baptismo non potest producere filiam suscipientis ante vel post genitam. . . .

The tone of the whole is that of the conscientious ecclesiastic, eager to instruct in the elements of Christian faith and practice. From a reference on f. 64<sup>B</sup>: *ut docuit bone memorie cancellarius lincolniensis, mundat id est mundum servat*, which refers doubtless to William of Leicester (Guillelmus de Montibus † 1213), we are led to date the work 1225 or later, while he was himself Archdeacon of Leicester.<sup>4</sup> The phrase *bone memorie* will be found in general to be used for only a few years after the death of the person referred to. It has a personal tone which would indicate recent bereavement, both of the writer or speaker and of those he is addressing, implying that many in his hearing would have been acquaintances of the deceased chancellor. On this supposition, the treatise would have been intended for the parish clergy of the diocese of Leicester.

S. HARRISON THOMSON

*Los Angeles*

---

entitled *Tractatus a Ricardo premonstratensis ordinis*. It is also in British Museum Royal 4 B. VIII, f. 244<sup>b</sup> ff.

<sup>4</sup> See Stevenson, F. S., *Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln* (London, 1899), p. 26.

## THUNOR IN KENT

In contrast to Woden, the god Thunor, as is well known, left remarkably few traces in England.<sup>1</sup> Neither in writings nor in place-names was he much recalled, as far as our evidence goes. Whatever the reasons for this state of things, there is interest in any reference to him that can be found. One of these, long ago mentioned by J. M. Kemble,<sup>2</sup> requires an additional note for completeness.

In two of the lives of the seventh-century Sts. Etheldred and Ethelbert,<sup>3</sup> who were kept from the throne of Kent by their cousin Egbert, the story is told that they were murdered by an evil and ambitious nobleman, of whom it is remarked by Simeon of Durham: "Vocabatur porro convenienti sibi nomine Thunur, quod latina interpretatione sonat, tonitrus." Thunur was properly punished for his wickedness when the earth opened on the Island of Thanet and swallowed him alive.

Since Kemble did not give the source from which he took his version of the legend, his account cannot be checked. He failed, at all events, to note the important point, which is clearly stated both by Simeon of Durham and John of Tynemouth, that the place where Thunur met his end was thereafter connected with his name. According to at least one manuscript of Simeon of Durham,<sup>4</sup> it was called Thuner-hleaw; and John of Tynemouth<sup>5</sup> recorded that "ab incolis usque hodie Thunnirslau vocitatur." This evidently refers to a *hlæw*, or barrow, of some sort, which is scarcely what one would expect as the designation of such a pit or cleft in the earth as the legend suggests. An alternative reading is furnished by the manuscript of Simeon printed by the Bollandists,<sup>6</sup> which is Thuner-

<sup>1</sup> E. Björkman, *Zur englischen Namenkunde*, 1912 (*Studien zur englischen Phil.* 47), listed only four place-names embodying the god's name. The list in J. M. Kemble, *The Saxons in England*, new ed., W. de G. Birch, 1876, I, 347-348, will not bear close scrutiny.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 348-349.

<sup>3</sup> A. Simeon of Durham, ed. A. S. S., 17 Oct., VIII, 96-99, and T. Arnold, *Rolls Ser.* 75, 1882-5, II, 1-13; B. John of Tynemouth, ed. C. Horstmann, *Nova Legenda Angliae*, 1891, I, 429-431.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Arnold, II, 12.

<sup>5</sup> Ed. Horstmann, I, 431.

<sup>6</sup> P. 99.

hleap. A local Kentish historian of the early eighteenth century, quoted in Dugdale,<sup>7</sup> who gives the legend, followed the second reading and had this to say about the matter: "The Puteus Thunor of Thunors-lep is very plainly the old chalk-pit, called Mynstre chalk-pit, which it is not unlikely was first sunk when the abbey and church of Minstre were built. . . . However this be, I can't find that any place in this island (Thanet) goes now by the name of Thunorsleap."

It is impossible, I think, to decide which of the two readings I have mentioned is the earlier. One wonders whether the confusion may not have arisen through misunderstanding of the Old English form of *w*, as might well have happened. Even so, the matter is obscure. The one thing that seems certain is that in the twelfth and fourteenth centuries some spot on the Island of Thanet preserved the name of Thunor.

GORDON HALL GEROULD

Princeton University

#### ANGLO-NORMAN SUITE 'WORK(?)'

In the text of *Narrationes*, a legal formula-book of the early part of the fourteenth century written in Anglo-Norman, a passage concerning the right to dig turf for fuel in a common turbary presents a problem in the choice of the correct variant, more than half a dozen different readings being found in twenty-three manuscripts which contain the passage.<sup>1</sup> The problem is complicated by the fact that although in the less abridged versions the phrase occurs more than once, the word that is the center of the problem sometimes varies from one passage to another in the same manuscript.

In the best manuscript of the group, Lambeth Palace Library, no. 564, the text reads:

Atort par sa garrauntie ne lui soeffre auer commune de turbarie en N. appurtenant a son franc tenement en mesme la ville qe en cel auer deit

<sup>7</sup> *Monasticon Anglicanum*, ed. Caley, Ellis, and Bandinel, 1817, I, 447, note b. Quotation from Lewis, *History of the Isle of Tenet*, 1723, p. 51.

<sup>1</sup> Thirty-seven manuscripts of the formula-book have been examined, in preparation for a forthcoming edition, but the other fourteen either contain a different collection of formulae or are fragmentary.

nomement en cent acres de turbarie s. la feaute de .vj. hommes par .vj. iours par an en este,<sup>2</sup>

which may be translated:

Wrongfully and contrary to his warranty he (the lord) will not suffer him (the tenant) to have common of turbary in N. appurtenant to his freehold in the same vill which he ought to have in it, specifically in one hundred acres of turbary, to wit, the fealty of six men for six days a year in summer.

Even after making allowance for the crabbed legal style of the passage, it is evident that 'the *fealty* of six men for six days a year in summer' is a difficult reading, as is indicated by the unusually large number of variants furnished by the manuscripts. The chief variant readings are *suite* (*seute*, *sieute*, *sute*), *fouaille*, and *fower*; but abnormal forms like *fount*, *fest*, *feut*, *fuste*, *foaulte* (or *foaute*), *seut*, and *suist* also occur. As has been stated, the same form does not always occur in repetitions of the passage. Thus, one scribe wrote first *fount*, then *fest*, and another scribe wrote *seut* and *feut*, showing that they did not know the correct formula.

Of the four chief readings, *feaute*, *fouaille*, *fower*, and *suite*, the first, *feaute*, although found in the best manuscript, Lambeth 564, is the least plausible. It is found in only one other manuscript, Rawlinson C. 459, which is neither an especially good text nor of the same family as Lambeth 564. In itself, *feaute* < Lat. *fidelitatem* is an important legal term, for it meant not only the oath of fidelity to the king, but also the oath of fidelity sworn by a tenant to his lord which usually included a promise to perform the services due from his tenement.<sup>3</sup> In France at this period according to Godefroy,<sup>4</sup> it also signified a body of eschevins (borough or gild officials somewhat similar to aldermen), but I have not found this usage in England. None of these meanings is appropriate to the passage.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Lambeth 564, fo. 161r.

<sup>3</sup> The oath of fealty began 'I will bear faith' and the oath of homage 'I become your man.' Fealty was due to the lord from all classes of men whereas homage was connected with knight-service. However, after one did homage, if any services were due from his lands he also swore fealty, and the two are very often coupled.

<sup>4</sup> F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, s. v. FEALTÉ.

Greater manuscript support is found for *fouaille* (*fowaille*) < Lat. *focalia* meaning 'fuel,' for it is found in four manuscripts;<sup>5</sup> but it is generally in conjunction with *fower*. As the turf was, of course, used as fuel, the reading 'the fuel of six men for six days a year in summer' has some claim to consideration; but the lack of conviction on the part of the scribes and the general unfitness of the word *fouaille* in the passage lead to its rejection.

*Fower* < Lat. *fodere* 'to dig' is found in thirteen manuscripts, the greatest number supporting any one reading. The fact that the form is an infinitive is no objection to its authenticity, for the use of an infinitive as substantive is particularly common in legal Anglo-Norman, from which such expressions as a *render*, a *remainder*, a *demurrer*, and an *attainder*, all originally infinitives, have passed into English. The question of the usage in this passage would be settled at once if a parallel passage in some other source could be found. Unfortunately an action for common of turbary is rare, and a search of the printed yearbooks (Rolls and Selden Society series) has not brought to light anything exactly similar to the moot passage. However, *fower* is commonly associated with turves and turbary. In *Yearbook 6 Edward II.* (Selden Soc.), pp. 92, 93, the phrases *le fower des turbes* and *fowant torbes* occur. In another part of *Narrationes* itself, in the section on waste, manuscripts read *de turbe* (or *turbes*) *fower* and *en fowaunt turbez* (or *turbaries*).<sup>6</sup> The digging of six men for six days a year in summer agrees with the tenor of the passage and with Anglo-Norman usage in general, and is, I believe, the form that would have been chosen by many a fourteenth century lawyer.

There remains the form *suite* (*seute*, *sieute*, *sute*). Although it is found in only three manuscripts,<sup>7</sup> these three are the closest to Lambeth 564, the best and earliest manuscript (which itself presented the unacceptable *feaute*, *foaute*).<sup>8</sup> Moreover, the scribes

<sup>5</sup> British Museum Additional 35095, Dunn 35, Lansdowne 475, Rawlinson C. 454.

<sup>6</sup> The variant readings *de turbes faire* and *en fesaunt turberie* perhaps explain the form *fount* found among the rejected readings; and the meaningless *fest*, *fuste*, and *feut* may also derive from the same source.

<sup>7</sup> These are Dunn 60, Hale 139 (Lincoln's Inn), and Royal 11 A viii. I am not here including the forms *seut* and *suist*, which occur in later manuscripts and which are found in company with other forms.

<sup>8</sup> *Feaute* is probably a misreading of *seute* written with a long *s*.

use the same word consistently each time the passage occurs (three times in each manuscript). The importance of the manuscripts (which in other respects have proved to be very faithful reproductions of the original) and the consistency of the scribes' use of *suite* make it necessary to consider this reading carefully.

*Suite* (< Lat. \**sequita*, derived from *sequor*) is widely current in the legal vocabulary, its technical meanings falling into two chief groups, one based on the idea of a following up or prosecution of an action at law<sup>9</sup> and the other based on the idea of a following or body of men. Since the first group is clearly not involved here, we may pass on to the second, which includes three chief uses: one, the group of five or more neighbors, who in the absence of a tally or documentary proof of indebtedness or contract, appeared in court in behalf of one of the parties to an action and swore to the truth of his statement;<sup>10</sup> two, a service due to a lord from a tenant involving the tenant's attendance at certain intervals at the seigniorial or hundred court to help transact the business of the court;<sup>11</sup> three, another type of service requiring that the tenant's grain or a certain portion of it be ground at the lord's mill.<sup>12</sup> Although at first sight 'suit of turbary'—the suit of six men for six days a year in summer—appears to be parallel to suit of court and suit of mill, a more exact consideration shows us that while suit of court and suit of mill are a form of service by the tenant and are thus a profit to the lord, the right of digging turf is no service by the tenant but a privilege to him and a loss to the lord. Basically, however, in the idea of a group of men doing something, the same idea underlies all these instances.

Although in a wide reading of legal Anglo-Norman I have found no exact parallel to the use of *suite* in the passage on common of turbary, the language during the first half of the fourteenth century

<sup>9</sup> Cf. law-suit, bring suit.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *NED.*, SUIT IV. 16. c. This is a survival of an earlier custom which permitted even murderers to acquit themselves by producing suit. (In such cases 18 to 36 oath-helpers were required.)

<sup>11</sup> Cf. N. E. D. SUIT I. 1. a. The suitors of the court served as an assise or jury of witnesses when facts were to be ascertained; and if the case was carried to a higher court, the evidence of the body of suitors was the sole record of what had been transacted in the lower court. Failure to attend at the required times was punishable by amercement.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. N. E. D. SUIT I. 3.



was flexible enough for the compiler of *Narrationes* to have used it, even though this be the only recorded example of it. Words or meanings are quite frequently known by a single instance. In fact, at the moment, another meaning of *suite* belonging to the same group, 'the family or children of a serf' <sup>13</sup> (known in Latin as *sequela* <sup>14</sup>), is, in my collection of slips, supported by only a single quotation.<sup>15</sup> I believe that the compiler of *Narrationes* actually wrote *suite* using it in the sense of 'work, services,' but that this meaning did not gain wide currency, so that when the scribes of the other groups of manuscripts (for the most part, fifty or more years later) came to copy the passage, they substituted the better known *fower*, which was already associated in their minds with *turbary*.

ELSIE SHANKS

*The Johns Hopkins University*

## THE BEGINNINGS OF FRENCH UVULAR R

Trautmann's theory <sup>1</sup> that French uvular *r* arose as an affectation in court circles of the seventeenth century, from which it spread, not only through much of France, but to German courts and then to lower strata of German society—and from there, I might add, to Manhattan,—was combated by Jespersen <sup>2</sup> on two grounds: (1) because, so far as the seventeenth century is concerned, Trautmann relied solely on the evidence of Chapelle, who, in 1686, mentioned meeting ladies whose *parler gras* was a faint imitation of that of Paris, and Jespersen pointed out that *parler gras* might refer to other linguistic peculiarities than the pronunciation of *r* with the soft palate; (2) because Molière attributed no such pronunciation to the women he satirized in the *Précieuses* and the *Femmes savantes*. He then proposed an hypothesis of his own, that uvular *r*

<sup>13</sup> Cf. N. E. D. *SUIT* IV. 17.

<sup>14</sup> *Secta* is the usual medieval Latin equivalent of *suite* in its various meanings, but it is sometimes interchanged with *sequela*, a looseness of usage which came about from the employment of both in the sense of 'consequences' (both derive ultimately from *sequor*).

<sup>15</sup> J. H. Bloom, *Charters in the Cathedral Library of Worcester* (Worcester Historical Society), p. 185.

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia*, III (1880), 208 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *The Articulation of Speech Sounds*, Marburg, 1889, pp. 72-3.

developed with modern cities, for, according to him, the sound is softer than that of lingual *r* and consequently better adapted to refined existence, such as that of cities is supposed to be.<sup>3</sup>

Now Jespersen was correct in asserting that *parler gras* did not necessarily mean using uvular *r*. Indeed, the expression seems to be older in France than that sound. It means literally to speak as if one had something soft in the mouth, we should say, a potato. *Grasseyer*, which appears to be derived from it, is mentioned under the form *grassier* by Palsgrave. Littré gives an example of *voix grasse* from Montaigne, of *parler gras* from Amyot. In 1632 Cotgrave defines *grassier* as "to lisp," *parler gras* as "a lisping; or not pronouncing of R." Even in 1719 Richelet defines *parler gras* as "avoir la langue grasse, c'est-à-dire épaisse; ce qui fait qu'on ne peut pas bien prononcer l'*r* ou le *ch*." We see, then, that Trautmann had no satisfactory evidence for the existence of uvular *r* in the seventeenth century.

But this does not mean that he was wrong, or that Jespersen was right. The latter's remark about Molière shows that he had reflected little upon the subject, or that he was misled by his theory of city influence. In the *Précieuses* the young ladies are provincials, freshly arrived in Paris, knowing the ways of fashionable society only from the *Grand Cyrus* and other books, never, probably, having heard a women of the court converse. In the *Femmes savantes* the learned women are supporters of the city, not of the court, which is attacked by their hero, Trissotin (vv. 1327-40). The same thing can be said about *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, II, 4, in which a professor describes the pronunciation of *r*. His is obviously a lingual *r*, but he as obviously had no connection with the court.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>These theories were restated by S. F. Euren in his "Etudes sur l'*R* français," Uppsala, 1896. Nyrop agrees with Trautmann that the uvular *r* did not appear until some time in the seventeenth century; cf. his *Grammaire historique*, 1899, I, 287-9 (1914, I, 343-5), and his *Manuel phonétique*, 1902, pp. 32-4; see also Brunot, *Précis de grammaire historique*, 1933, pp. 15-16. Nyrop dismisses Saint Louis's statement that "li rendres escorchoit la gorge par les erres qui y sont" on the ground that the king was referring to the rolling of *r* in the front of the mouth, "non pas dans la gorge proprement dite." Even if Saint Louis meant to indicate uvular *r*, his evidence would show merely a sporadic use of it, for no other reference to it has been found before the seventeenth century.

<sup>4</sup>This may be also said of Cordemoy, who described only lingual *r* in 1668; cf. Nyrop, *loc. cit.*

As for Jespersen's suggestion about the influence of city life, why, if it is correct, did the "burr" develop in Northumberland rather than in London and why has it never appeared in the speech of the Anglo-American or Irish-American populations of New York and Chicago? If, moreover, he had looked further than Molière in dramatic texts of the seventeenth century, he would have found evidence damaging to his conclusions.

Molière was not the only French actor and dramatist who poked fun at the *précieuses*. Raymond Poisson, who acted at a rival theater, published in 1665 a play called *l'Après-Soupé des Auberges* in which there is a viscountess whose affectations constitute much of the comic element of his play. She pretends to be only fourteen and to be much alarmed by her husband's caresses, but her chief peculiarity is in her speech, described as a *grassayement* or *parler gras*. She appears to have been born in the provinces and to have lived in Touraine, but she has been for some time established at Paris, occupied by a law-suit against one of her relatives. Her peculiar pronunciation is not due to a physical defect, for she is quite able to speak correctly. It is said of her (sc. 2) :

Elle se pique fort de beauté, de jeunesse;  
Mais sur tout elle affecte un certain parlé gras,  
Qui la contraint si fort, que pour n'en rire pas,  
Il faut estre plongé dans la mélancolie;  
Tantost elle le parle, et puis elle l'oublie;  
Et cette ridicule encore sottement:  
Dit qu'elle n'a jamais pû parler autrement.<sup>5</sup>

That she is imitating a court affectation is shown when another woman tells her she knows people at court who would like to talk as the viscountess does (sc. 3) :

J'en connois à la Cour, dont la grace est extrême,  
Qui voudroient pour beaucoup sçauoir pecher de même,  
Car elles tâchent fort à parler comme vous.

Now the viscountess's linguistic peculiarities are limited to *r* and to the sounds written phonetically *k*, *g*, *ʃ*, *ʒ*, *s*. Her affected pronunciation of these last is written, respectively, *t*, *d*, *s*, *z*, *z*. The sounds are fronted, vocalized, or unpalatalized, with the effect that

<sup>5</sup> This and the other quotations are from the edition of 1665. I am obliged to Dr. L. E. Dabney for checking them against the copy at the Bibliothèque Nationale, yf. 7002.

her speech becomes soft and mincing. Instead of "J'aime la soupe aux choux avecque des pigeons," she pronounces "z'aime la soupe aux Soux avecque des Pizons." Of course, she is not thoroughly consistent, for Poisson did not wish her to be, nor, probably, was he enough of a phonetician to have made her so, nor, had he done so, could his audience have understood her. The tendency of her speech is, however, clear enough. She usually changes *r* to *l*, an alteration that had often occurred in France before her time. The *r* so changed must have been apical, for uvular *r* is not formed near enough to *l* to account for the substitution. The effect of her mannerisms is well illustrated by the following lines:<sup>6</sup>

Ze me souuiens touzoul te z'estois dans un Toce,  
Z'allois ze pense à Touls, et leuenois de Loce,  
Z'appellois un Tocé; Tocé, Tocé, Tocé,  
Et zamais ce Tocé ne voulut aplocé.

What is important, however, is not that her *r* is usually changed to *l*, but that occasionally it is not. Before *l* or when final, it may be dropped;<sup>7</sup> while after *g* and before *a*, the orthography is most significant. While [gra] is written *gla* (*glassayement* and *glace*, sc. 3), I find for [grā] both *gla*n and *guea*n (*gland*, *gueans*, sc. 3, for *grand*, *grands*) and for [gra] *guea*, a spelling that occurs in sc. 9, and several times in sc. 3, notably in the couplet,

C'est poul vous disle donc te ze pallois si gueas,  
Si gueas, si gueas, si gueas, t'on ne m'entendet pas.

In other words, the only important exception to the change of *r* to *l* occurs after the voiced back consonant [g] and before the vowel [a], which is one of the positions where one would expect uvular *r* first to appear.<sup>8</sup> Now when Poisson wrote *gueas* he

<sup>6</sup> What she means is:

Je me souviens toujours que j'étais dans un Coche,  
J'allais, je pense, à Tours, et revenais de Loche,  
J'appelais un Cocher, "Cocher, Cocher, Cocher,"  
Et jamais ce Cocher ne voulut aprocher.

<sup>7</sup> *Parler* is usually pronounced *paller*, but in sc. 9 I find *palez* for *parlez*, in sc. 3 *pallé* for *parler*, though the *er* of infinitives is usually written *el*.

<sup>8</sup> The others would be between [g] and the back vowels. The viscountess gives no example of [gru] or of [gr ]. In two words that we pronounce [gro-] the *r* becomes *l* (*glossielement*, found once in sc. 3, and *glosse*, found twice in sc. 10). As [k] usually becomes [t], her *r* is regularly *l* after this sound.

obviously meant that his heroine gave to the *r* of *gras* some other sound than the apical *r* of her contemporaries or the *l* that she usually substituted for that letter. He could not have meant it to have the value of *é* or of any other vowel, for in that case the last line quoted would have fifteen syllables. If he had meant that *r* was dropped, he would have written *gas*, just as he wrote *paler* for *parler*. If he had wished to indicate a glide [j], he would have written *guias*, as he wrote *siege*, *soutient*. If, by *gueas*, he had meant [gwa], he would have written *gouas*, just as his contemporaries wrote *Jouan*. What sound could he have meant other than that of uvular *r*, which the consonant certainly had in the eighteenth century<sup>9</sup> and which Poisson expressed about as well as he could do without a phonetic alphabet? Of course, the evidence would be stronger if he had written *gueossielement* and *gueosse* instead of *glossielement* and *glosse*,<sup>10</sup> but he and his viscountess were not always consistent<sup>11</sup> and cannot be held to too strict an account. The most reasonable conclusion is, therefore, that we have in this play the first attempt to record the use in French of uvular *r*.

Poisson's evidence confirms Trautmann's theory so far as France is concerned and refutes Jespersen's. It does not support Thurot, who suggested that in the seventeenth century medial or final *r* was lingual while initial *r* was uvular.<sup>12</sup> It leads to the conclusion that up to the middle of the century French *r* was regularly apical and that, when a person "parlait gras," he dropped the *r* or substituted an *l* for it, while, probably not very long before 1665, the back sound began to be used at court after [g] and before [a], possibly in other positions for which we have no record. This *r*

<sup>9</sup> In 1733 Dumas condemned a disagreeable use of the throat in pronouncing such words as *Rhône*, *Pierre*, *roc*. Cf. Thurot, *De la Prononciation française*, 1883, II, 270.

<sup>10</sup> Dr. E. C. Armstrong pointed this out when I read this paper before the MLA, but he suggested no sound that would explain Poisson's writing *gueas*, *guean*, and *guea*, so satisfactorily as my theory that he was trying to indicate uvular *r*. As Poisson could not express this sound by *r*, he was obliged to resort to a symbol which would inevitably seem queer to us, but which he could easily explain to the actress concerned.

<sup>11</sup> Note, for instance, not only *glan* and *guean* cited above, but *dile* and *disle* for *dire* (sc. 3), *tloile* and *cleve* for *croire* and *crève* (sc. 3), *aplocé* and *toulmentier* for *aprocher* and *tourmentier* (sc. 3).

<sup>12</sup> Nyrop (*op. cit.*, I (1899), 289) finds Thurot's suggestion "invraisemblable."

was probably not trilled, for, if it had been, the sound would have seemed no softer to the viscountess than lingual *r* and she would merely have changed it, along with her other *r*'s, to *l*.

If these facts are correct, one may seek the reason for the introduction of uvular *r*, as well as that of the other affected sounds employed by the viscountess, not in city, but in court influence. One may explain the phenomenon by the "theory of the leisure classes." If a lady doesn't raise her voice, it may be because she has servants and admirers who are listening for her softest whisper. Conversely those who wish to be mistaken for ladies with servants and admirers will not raise their voices either. Thus imitation thrives until the peculiar mannerisms of the duchess have become the unconscious usage of the chambermaid. We know that many of the adventures in vocabulary of the *précieuses* did not permanently affect the French language, but that some of them did. Similarly the viscountess's treatment of palatals was soon forgotten, but her peculiar use of *r* remained and flourished, passing into other positions than between *g* and *a* and into other mouths than those of courtiers and their imitators, until it attained the dominant position it enjoys in France today.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

#### JEAN RENART AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF *GALERAN DE BRETAGNE*

That Jean Renart, author of the *Lai de l'Ombre*, wrote also the *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* seems to be established beyond reasonable doubt.<sup>1</sup> A fourth work, however, has been ascribed to the same poet by C. V. Langlois,<sup>2</sup> who sees in correspondences be-

<sup>1</sup> See F. M. Warren, "The Works of Jean Renart, Poet, and their Relation to *Galeran de Bretagne*," *MLN.*, xxxiii (1908), 69-73 and 97-100; G. Charlier, "L'Escoufle et Guillaume de Dole" in *Mélanges de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offerts à M. Wilmotte* (Paris, 1910), 81-98; C. V. Langlois, *La Vie en France au moyen âge d'après des romans mon-dains du temps* (Paris, 1924), passim; E. Färber, "Die Sprache der dem Jean Renart zugeschriebenen Werke," *RF.*, xxxiii (1915), 683-793; J. Bédier, *Le Lai de l'Ombre* (Paris, 1913), vii-xx.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*

tween Jean Renart's compositions and *Galeran de Bretagne* necessity for assuming *Renaus*, as the name of the author appears in the manuscript of the latter poem, to be a faulty reading for *Renars*, although a similar hypothesis had already been considered by F. M. Warren and rejected on the ground that the repetition of rimes, phrases, and expressions characteristic of Jean Renart is lacking in *Galeran*.<sup>3</sup>

*Galeran*'s connection with the *Escoufle*, *G. de Dole*, and *Ombre* is hardly to be doubted; the question is whether this connection is the result of common authorship or of imitation. Langlois holds that one must accept either Renart as common author of all four poems or the highly improbable supposition that

un nommé Renaut, qui composa *Galeran*, a connu les œuvres de Renart, et que, avec une industrie étonnante, il les a imités en se servant de tous les procédés de son quasi-homonyme, avec autant de dextérité que celui-ci l'aurait fait lui-même.

This view of the matter has been supported by Lucien Foulet,<sup>4</sup> the most recent editor of *Galeran*, and has since then been more or less generally accepted.<sup>5</sup>

It is certainly more than improbable that *Galeran* was composed in imitation of the works of Jean Renart—especially since all indications point to its having been the first in date of the four poems—but does Renart's authorship of the work necessarily follow therefrom? Langlois in posing his alternatives seems to have overlooked a third possibility, proposed and favored by Warren, namely, that Renart, distinct from the author of *Galeran*, knew and admired the latter poem to the extent of borrowing from it in the composition of his own works. I can see no valid objection that might be raised to such an hypothesis and, consequently, no justification for deciding either in favor of or against Renart's paternity of *Galeran* on the basis of the evidence thus far adduced. In the absence of more decisive factors, any conclusion in the matter must repose on more or less subjective grounds, and if the problem is to be satisfactorily solved, we must look for new evidence.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> In *Romania*, LI (1925), 70-104 and introduction to his edition (*Classiques français du moyen âge*, 37, Paris, 1925).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Langfors, *Romania*, LI, 296, note, and Hilka, *ZRP.*, XLVI (1926), 488.

Foulet, seeking to corroborate the stand of Langlois, has attempted to show in the introduction to his edition of the romance that the language and versification of *Galeran* are in accord with those of the other three compositions. Let us review some portions of his exposition to see whether the significance of certain points may not have escaped him. On the basis of proportions of total rich rimes, *Galeran*, with 57%, would seem not to diverge from the tendency in riming shown by the *Ombre*, *Escoufle*, and *G. de Dole*, which have 59.5%, 50%, and 40.5% respectively.<sup>6</sup> These percentages, however, are an insufficient index of the poet's riming practice; for, distribution of the rimes into the six classes established by Freymond<sup>7</sup> reveals in *Galeran* a practice in two respects markedly different from that of the other three poems in that *Galeran* gives evidence of much greater care in avoiding merely sufficient masculine rimes and of a decidedly greater striving after leonine rime. *G. de Dole* contains 34% sufficient masculine rimes, the *Ombre* 24%, and the *Escoufle* 23%, while *Galeran* has but slightly over half the last two proportions, that is, 12.5%. The striving for leonine rime can be best appreciated by comparison of the respective proportions of masculine rimes extending over the penultimate vowel (category IV in Freymond's classification). *Galeran* has 13% rimes of this type, or over twice as many as the *Ombre*, which has but 6%; the *Escoufle* and *G. de Dole* have still fewer, 5% and 4.5%.

These variations from the practice shown by the three works whose paternity is not in question, while significant, could hardly, of course, in themselves furnish justification for denying the authorship of *Galeran* to Jean Renart. But there exists another difference in verse technique between *Galeran* on the one hand and the *Escoufle* and *G. de Dole* on the other, which indicates in a more imperative manner that the first named romance is not the work of the same composer as the other two.<sup>8</sup>

One frequently finds in the rimed poems of the twelfth and

<sup>6</sup> These and succeeding percentages for the *Ombre*, *G. de Dole*, and *Escoufle* are furnished by Färber, *op. cit.*, 701; those for *Galeran* are based on a scrutiny of the first 2,000 lines.

<sup>7</sup> "Ueber den reichen Reim bei altfranzösischen Dichtern," *ZRPk.*, vi, 1-36.

<sup>8</sup> The *Ombre*, because of its brevity, may be left out of account here.



thirteenth centuries couplets in which the poet, unable to achieve complete homophony, was satisfied with an approximation, such as *jambe: chambre, sache: age, onques: oncles*, etc., or even at times with mere assonance.<sup>9</sup> The practice regarding the admission of such imperfect rimes varied: some writers, like Chrétien de Troyes, show themselves to have been rigorous to the point of excluding them entirely; others admitted but a restricted number of approximations sanctioned, as it were, by wide usage and probably deriving some measure of justification from current pronunciation;<sup>10</sup> still others had no scruples about admitting defective rimes and occasional assonances without apparent regard for justification.

Foulet asserts that the same practice in respect to insufficient riming is evidenced in *Galeran* as in the *Escoufle* and *G. de Dole*;<sup>11</sup> if imperfect rimes are far more numerous in the latter two romances, it is, he explains, because Jean Renart when writing *Galeran* was possessed of more leisure and a "métier plus sûr." Let us see.

*Galeran*, according to Foulet, contains three imperfect rimes, to wit, *sage: marge* 6433-4, *Brez: apers* 3601-2, and *tempre: atrempe* 7395-6. *Atrempe*, however, is, there can be no doubt, a metathetical form of the copyist for the older *atempre* (*adtemperare*), and the rime is, consequently, a good one.<sup>12</sup> *Bers*, moreover, would be an equally good reading for *Brez* and is, in fact, that which Foulet himself at first adopted and the one to be actually found in his text; it remains uncertain, then, whether the rime involved is truly defective or not. Equal uncertainty exists in the case of *sage: marge*, the reading *marge* being unsatisfactory as to sense.<sup>13</sup> There is, nevertheless, one apparently unquestionable instance, evidently overlooked by Foulet, of insufficient riming in *Galeran*, *bouche: escorche* 563-4.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Tobler, *Le Vers français*, 150; Freymond, *op. cit.*, 212.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Constans, *Le Roman de Troie*, VI, 106-107.

<sup>11</sup> Introduction to *Galeran*, xxvi-xxvii.

<sup>12</sup> *Atrempee* (: *vespre*) 4316 should likewise be corrected to *atempree*, thus rendering the rime rich.

<sup>13</sup> Foulet, in his glossary, suggests that *marge* be read *marche*, but this, as he himself seems to admit, offers a sense hardly more satisfactory: a more acceptable correction would be *lignage*, which would not only satisfy sense, meter, and rime but would be supported by verse 1906, where it occurs in a strikingly analogous passage and equally in rime with *sage*.

<sup>14</sup> In addition to being imperfect, this is a bastard rime, a fact which

Let us examine now *bouche: escorche* together with the doubtful *Brez: apers* and *sage: marge*. In all three cases, it will be noted, the element of imperfection is the same and can be expressed by the formula *vowel + consonant: vowel + R + consonant*. Rimes of this type are exceedingly common and may be found in all but a very few of the poets of the time.<sup>15</sup> Marie de France, otherwise meticulous in her rimes, admits them occasionally,<sup>16</sup> thereby following a practice similar to that of the author of *Galeran*. The *wide-spread* occurrence of this rime, especially its intrusion into works which bear no other trace of defective riming, leads to the conclusion that *r* before a consonant—and particularly before a sibilant or a fricative, as is the case in the three instances from *Galeran*—had become weakened in pronunciation to the point of being almost effaced.<sup>17</sup> That *r* in this position did not become completely silent, or that its silence was a dialectal trait,<sup>18</sup> and that, consequently, rime involving it was not considered entirely correct seems to be indicated by the fact that rigorous rimers like Chrétien de Troyes and Gautier d'Arras avoid it. The exceedingly small number of cases of its occurrence in *Galeran*—remember only one is certain—would indicate that the author, in whom we must now recognize an exactitude in riming equaled by very few of his contemporaries, admitted only with extreme reluctance even this widely condoned expedient.

Examination of the *Escoufle* and *G. de Dole* reveals none of the care in riming manifest in *Galeran*; Jean Renart in these two poems admits freely not only rimes of the type *vowel + consonant: vowel + R + consonant* (twenty-two examples in *G. de Dole*, eleven in the *Escoufle*) but other types of defective rimes and even mere assonance as well. There are in all sixty-seven cases of imperfect riming in *G. de Dole* and forty-five cases in the *Escoufle*. Illus-

has, however, no significance for our problem. Cf. G. Wacker, *Ueber das Verhältnis von Dialekt und Schriftsprache im Altfranzösischen* (Halle, 1916), 55, 56, and 58.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. H. Andresen, *Ueber den Einfluss von Metrum und Reim auf die Sprache der altfranzösischen Dichter* (Bonn, 1874), 18.

<sup>16</sup> *Guigemar*, 709-10; *Dous amanz*, 147-8; *Yonec*, 177-8; *Eliduc* 271-2.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Andresen, *loc. cit.* and Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Gram. d. frz. Sprache*, I (Heidelberg, 1913), § 165.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Gramm.*, § 475.

trative of the type of rime Jean Renart was willing to incorporate in his poems are:

serre: resne, *E.* 329-30; merveille: gentillece, *E.* 707-8; rivage: sache, *E.* 881-2; semonse: monte, *E.* 833-4; estre: tertre, *E.* 2405-6; chiere: vielle, *E.* 5027-8; table: males, *E.* 6045-6; trive: vile, *G. D.* 623-4; fermail: cheval, *G. D.* 1002-3; coissins: assis, *G. D.* 1516-7; onques: escharboncles, *G. D.* 2746-7; vespres: mestres, *G. D.* 2830-1; assis: einsî, *G. D.* 3584-5; angre: change, *G. D.* 4528-9, etc.

In short, *G. de Dole* and the *Escoufle* are, in direct contrast to the meticulously rimed *Galeran*, two of the most carelessly rimed compositions of the period.

In view of this wide separation in treatment of rimes, does it not seem more probable that we have to do here with two poets, the one adhering to more rigid artistic principles than the other, rather than with one who, as Foulet maintains, had "plus de loisir ou un métier plus sûr" when he wrote *Galeran*? It is entirely unlikely that an artist who so carefully abstains from defective riming throughout almost 8,000 verses in one poem should give way to it so completely in others. Besides, there is very good reason to believe that *Galeran* antedates *G. de Dole*,<sup>19</sup> in which case Foulet's explanation of a "métier plus sûr" loses all force. Again, Jean Renart was in orders when he wrote *G. de Dole*,<sup>20</sup> where could he have found greater leisure than in a cloister or as the holder of a benefice procured for him by his protectors? Finally, by reason of the innovation of having intercalated lyrical fragments and songs in his romance, Jean Renart seems to have had especial pride in *G. de Dole*,<sup>21</sup> and, therefore, it is reasonable to believe that if he had thought exactitude in riming particularly desirable, he would have exerted himself to attain it in this work.

The rime is not alone in attesting that Jean Renart did not write

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Warren, *MLN.*, XIII (1898), 349, and XXIII (1898), 99-100; Langlois, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 and 78. If Jean Renart had written *Galeran*, and written it after *G. de Dole*, would he not have continued in it his innovation of intercalated lyrics, the occasions presenting themselves so naturally? Cf. *Galeran*, vv. 1964 ff., 2278 ff., 6901, 6975 ff., etc.

<sup>20</sup> Foulet's attempt to show that the final verses of *G. de Dole*, in which Renart's entry into religion is indicated, are an addition of the copyist (*Romania*, LI, 87-94) is wholly unconvincing. Cf. Langlois, *op. cit.*, 356, note.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Langlois, *op. cit.*, 75.

*Galeran*; for, although the language of the poem does not diverge greatly from that of the three known works of Renart, there are, nevertheless, a few particularities that support the testimony of the rime.

In addition to the regular Francien form *ceus* of the demonstrative pronoun, there appears in *Galeran* the Picard doublet *chous*: the other three compositions give no evidence of *chous*, but show a third form *ciaus* or *chiaux*, which does not occur in *Galeran*. Foulet would explain this by the supposition that Renart employed all three forms,<sup>22</sup> but in that case, is it not strange that no trace of *ciaus* is to be found in *Galeran* nor of *chous* in the *Escoufle*, *Ombre*, and *G. de Dole*?

In *G. de Dole*, the *Escoufle*, and the *Ombre*, the third person possessive tonic pronoun appears in its older form *suen*, assured by rimes like *quens: suens* (*E.* 2789-90), *sens: suens* (*O.* 193-4), *chamberlens: soens* (*G. D.* 1540-1);<sup>23</sup> in *Galeran* we find only the analogical form *sien*, attested by rimes with *bien* and *rien*.<sup>24</sup> On the basis of the rimes *quens: biens* (*E.* 8637-8) and *en: Julien* (*E.* 4867-8), Foulet seeks to obviate this serious objection to his thesis by assuming that Jean Renart admitted the riming of *-uen* and *-en* with *-ien*, whence it would result that

dans toutes les rimes de ce genre, *suen* et *sien* sont interchangeable, et l'auteur des quatre romans, si on le suppose unique, a pu se servir de l'une ou de l'autre forme à son gré, ou même s'en tenir à une seule, qui dans ce cas et quel que soit le témoignage des copistes, a bien des chances d'avoir été *suen*.<sup>25</sup>

This explanation, however ingenious, is on its face unsatisfactory; for, even granting its premises, there would still remain the singular fact that *Galeran* shows no cases of the pronoun in question in rime with *-uen* or *-en*, nor the assemblage of the other three works of its riming with *-ien*, although in all four it occurs sufficiently often at the rime. Moreover, the argument is invalid on the more vital grounds of its primary assumption, the riming of *-ien* with *-uen* and *-en*. Although *-uen: -en* is not uncommon in Old French,<sup>26</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Introduction to *Galeran*, xvi.

<sup>23</sup> Färber gives a complete list of these rimes, *op. cit.*, 731-732.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Foulet, introduction to *Galeran*, xvii.

<sup>25</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Tobler, *Dis dou vrai aniel*, xxiv.

Jean Renart's riming *-ien* with *-uen* and *-en* would, I believe, be a unique instance of the practice. In any event, *en: Julien* and *cuens: biens* do not, as Foulet supposes, testify the possibility of such a rime; for, in the first case, the meter shows unequivocally that the name was pronounced *Juliën*, and in the second case, as Färber has already pointed out,<sup>27</sup> *biens* should be read *buens*.

Finally, in *Galeran* is manifested a predilection for the accusative ending *-ain* of feminine proper names that amounts almost to an affectation.<sup>28</sup> Thus, we find recurring forms like *Fraisnain*, *Ydein*, *Rosain*, etc. The *Escoufle*, *Ombre*, and *G. de Dole* are without the slightest suggestion of a similar tendency.

In view of the fore-going assemblage of facts, we must recognize that *Galeran* is not the work of the man who wrote the *Escoufle*, *Ombre*, and *G. de Dole*, and that for whatever real correspondences exist between the poem and Jean Renart's compositions some other explanation must be found than that of common authorship. Consequently, we no longer have any reason to doubt the testimony of the manuscript when it gives the name of the author as *Renaus*.

VERNON FREDERIC KOENIG

Western Reserve University

## THE DATE OF *CIPERIS DE VIGNEVAUX*

The obviously late *chanson de geste* devoted to the adventures of Cipéris de Vigneaux, a critical edition of which is a *desideratum*, was tentatively considered by Paulin Paris as a product of the fourteenth century:<sup>1</sup>

Quant au texte renouvelé que nous avons eu sous les yeux, il ne semble pas accuser une date antérieure aux guerres d'Edouard d'Angleterre et de Philippe de Valois . . . la cantilène de Cipéris . . . fut . . . renouvelée . . . par un rimeur artésien ou flamand, sous le règne de Philippe de Valois, ou même sous celui de Jean, son successeur.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, 732.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Foulet, introduction to *Galeran*, xx.

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire littéraire*, xxvi (1873), p. 39. Cf. also G. Gröber, *Geschichte der mittelfranzösischen Literatur*, I<sup>2</sup> (Berlin-Leipzig, 1933), p. 98.

According to Paulin Paris, then, the earliest date of the poem would be the year 1328, when Philip VI ascended the throne of France. Elsewhere<sup>2</sup> the same scholar observes:

Le comte de Flandre paya chèrement ses avis, qui peut-être présentent encore une allusion au soulèvement des Flamands contre leur comte Louis de Nevers, accusé par eux de favoriser Philippe de Valois.

The rebellion alluded to practically coincided with the beginning of Philip VI's reign. Still in 1328 the Count of Flanders, aided by Philip, inflicted upon the Flemish burghers the disastrous defeat of Cassel.<sup>3</sup> Since the discontent of the Flemish cities with their Count was, however, a rather chronic state of affairs, by no means settled by the battle of Cassel, it is clear that the allusion, if the interpretation of Paris be correct, can furnish nothing but a *terminus a quo*. The poem may well be considerably younger.

Paulin Paris appears to have had the same feeling, as may be judged from a third remark of his:<sup>4</sup>

Il y eut une grande bataille; l'empereur fut abattu de cheval et amené dans la ville. Nous pourrions conjecturer, d'après la réception qu'on lui fit, que notre auteur écrivait après la bataille de Poitiers, et se souvenait de la courtoisie du prince de Galles à l'égard de son royal prisonnier.

If this suggestion be adopted, it would bring the poem down to the period following the battle of Poitiers or Maupertuis (1356), in which the French king John was taken prisoner by the Black Prince. The observation just quoted is, of course, not more than a suggestion: it is obvious that both the episode of the *chanson* and the conduct of the Black Prince merely reflect the knightly spirit of the times, when generosity toward the vanquished had not yet been banished from international politics.

The only ms. of the poem is of the fifteenth century. No valid conclusion can be drawn, in the absence of a critical edition, from the language of the composition. The spirit of the *chanson* and the knowledge the author had of other epics would off-hand make its composition *after* 1356 at least as likely as the tentative suggestion that would make it fall still in the reign of Philip VI. The

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Ernest Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, IV, 1 (1902), 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

matter can be determined more definitely, I believe, by a proper interpretation of other allusions to contemporary events. Since they seem to have escaped the attention of the French scholar, it will not be amiss to discuss them.

It might be asked, in the first place, whether Paulin Paris was justified in looking, as he did, for allusions to contemporary events in a poem purporting to relate facts taken from Merovingian history. That he was indeed justified may be seen from the following fact. The French king is supposed to have reigned in Merovingian times; yet this does not prevent him from making war against an 'Emperor of Germany' and from capturing this monarch in battle. Evidently, the author had no accurate knowledge of the map of Europe in the time of King Dagobert: he supposes it to have been what it was in the fourteenth century, with a French monarchy bordering, in the East, on the Holy Roman Empire ruled over by a potentate who might well be styled 'Emperor of Germany.'

The 'Emperor of Germany' just referred to is blessed with a most beautiful daughter, who is married, in due course, to one of the heroes of the epic. She receives in dowry, apart from the right of succession, since she is her father's only child, the crown and kingdom of Bohemia (Behaigne). Now Bohemia, though part of the Holy Roman Empire, was not under the direct control of the Emperor and certainly not at his disposal as intimated in the poem, until 1348, when Charles IV, King of Bohemia since the death of his father, the blind King John, in the battle of Crécy, mounted the imperial throne after the death of his rival and enemy, Louis of Bavaria. Bohemia remained in the power of the new imperial dynasty, the House of Luxemburg, until well beyond the end of the century. As a matter of fact, it grew semi-independent only as a result of the Hussite Wars in the fifteenth century. Nor can the poet be taxed with ignorance of these matters: whatever the blanks in his mind on the subject of Merovingian history, he certainly did know of the blind king of Bohemia, who had generously given his life for the French cause, and of his son, Young Charles, backed by the French king in his pretensions to the imperial throne. The year 1348 seems to me, then, a fairly trustworthy *terminus a quo*.

In the epic, Philip, King of Hungary, is the husband of the Emperor's niece. Besieged in the city of Moron by Aquilant, King of Cyprus, and a Saracen host, Philip requests the aid of the French army. King Dagobert, we are told, would doubtless have listened to this prayer, had he not been prevented, for the time being, by an invasion of France: the King of Navarre has overrun the country and is getting ready to besiege Paris! Dagobert must therefore first deliver his own country before he can think of coming to the rescue of the king of Hungary. It is needless to say that he accomplishes this task with relative ease and then marches against the host of the king of Cyprus, who had evidently not made much headway with his siege. This campaign, too, is victorious for the French arms: a terrible defeat is inflicted upon the unbelievers, and the king of Hungary is delivered.

It would be a mere waste of space and time to dwell on the absurdity that makes a king of Hungary contemporary with the Merovingian Dagobert. What the poet had obviously in mind was the Hungary of the fourteenth century, which had indeed been brought into some sort of personal union with the Holy Roman Empire, thanks to the marriage of Sigismund, the younger son of Charles IV, with Mary, the eldest daughter of King Louis the Great of Hungary and Poland. This marriage took place in 1377; Sigismund was crowned king of Hungary in 1387. He had not been on the throne very long when the Turks invaded Bulgaria and Servia, both dependencies of the crown of St. Stephen. In 1395 Sigismund marched against them, taking Little Nicopolis by storm. The news of the death of his queen, in whose right he held the crown, obliged him to return home. He would have been captured in the mountain passes leading from Wallachia into Hungary, occupied by the troops of one of his own rebellious subjects, had it not been for the bravery of a few of his nobles and of a small band of French knights who fought under his flag.

Having settled matters in Hungary, Sigismund resumed his war against the Turks. For this purpose, on his request and that of the Pope, the king of France, Charles VI, sent him an auxiliary army of 12,000 men under the command of John the Fearless, son of the Duke of Burgundy and the king's own cousin. The combined army of German, Hungarian and French troops, amounting



to some 60,000 men, invaded Serbia but suffered a terrible defeat, at Nicopolis, at the hands of Sultan Bajazed.<sup>5</sup>

The following facts mentioned in the poem would then constitute but echoes of contemporary history: (1) the king of Hungary is a relative or relative by marriage of the German Emperor (2) he is threatened by a Mohammedan invasion (3) he requests aid from the king of France and receives it.

The differences are, of course, no less glaring: (1) in the epic the king of Hungary is the husband of the Emperor's niece; in history Sigismund is the son of the Emperor Charles IV, the brother of the Emperor Wenceslas, and finally he is elected emperor himself; (2) Cyprus, in the fourteenth century, was not in Turkish hands but a possession of the Republic of Venice; the Turks did not conquer it until 1570; (3) the French army that marched to the aid of Sigismund did not win a victory but suffered a crushing defeat.

None of these differences constitutes a serious objection. The author of a *chanson de geste* may indeed be influenced by contemporary history; he cannot be expected, and he certainly is not bound, to reproduce faithfully contemporary historical facts such as dynastic relationships. Supposing him to be perfectly familiar with them (not an altogether easy task!), we must admit that the requirements of his plot will always have first consideration. Cyprus was known as an Oriental country, in close proximity to the Turks and the Holy Land. The fact that as yet it was in the hands of the Venetians may well have been unknown to the poet or may have deliberately been disregarded by him. Lastly, ever since the time of Louis IX the Christian arms in the East had suffered defeat after defeat, had in fact lost all the Latin possessions in Palestine and Syria. Yet the authors of *chansons de geste* went merrily on celebrating the terrible disasters inflicted upon the unbelievers by the Christian and French hosts. We know perfectly that the disaster of Nicopolis brought about no change in this genially optimistic attitude!

Unfortunately, we have no definite *terminus ad quem* for our poem. Yet if the year of the battle of Nicopolis (1396) is allowed to furnish a probable *terminus post quem*, the composition would

<sup>5</sup> Michael Horváth, *Geschichte der Ungarn*, I (Pesth, 1851), pp. 243 ff.

fall into the reign of Charles VI, some time between 1396 and 1415, the date of the resumption of the Hundred Years' War by Henry V.<sup>6</sup>

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

Washington, D. C.

### JOHN GIBSON LOCKHART, PROPAGANDIST OF GERMAN LITERATURE

When the complete history of Scotland's share in the diffusion of German thought is finally written, Scott's son-in-law, John Gibson Lockhart, will have his own respectable place in it. He was not, like Carlyle immediately after him, to turn the tide completely in Germany's direction, nor does he appear to have sensed the full importance of the newer German philosophy. But he did much to clear the path for his greater successor—his own versatile journalistic activity, and that of his countryman, R. P. Gillies, being most significant in the dissemination of German literature in the years immediately preceding Carlyle's advent.

Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* (1813) had made Germany and German literature the fashion, and it may be assumed that

<sup>6</sup> It would be interesting to identify, at least tentatively, the city of Moron in which Philip of Hungary is besieged by the Saracens. Neither the *Table des noms propres* of Ernest Langlois (1904) nor the *Historisch-geographisches Wörterbuch* of Hermann Oesterley (1883) mentions it. In these circumstances we venture the following suggestion. *Moron* seems to be identical with the region designated by the Latin name *Maronia*, meaning a strip of land on the coast of the Adriatic, south of Spalato. This *Maronia* is the Latin form of a Slavonic name derived from the root *mor* 'sea.' As a matter of fact, the coastal region in question was called from of old *παρθαλασσία*, *primorje*, *pomorje*; it is still known by the name of *Primorje*. Thus one Latin document describes the extent of the Kingdom of Croatia as follows: 'a ripa Danubi usque ad mare dalmaticum cum tota Maronia et Chelmie ducatu.' (Cf. Kukuljevič, *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, I, No. CCXXXIII, a. 1100, c. XIII.) Now it is to be noted that Chelmia or Chlum is still the name of the mountainous region lying back of Parathalassia or Primorje. Elsewhere we even hear of a *parochia Maronia*. (Cf. *Ibid.*, II, no. 111, a. 1102, p. 3.) Croatia was, of course, a part of Hungary, and since the French poet probably knew that a king of Cyprus can have reached Hungary only by sea, it was logical to suppose that the besieged city was on or near the Adriatic coast.

Lockhart too came under the influence of the book. It was, as he himself said later, in every hand, and few literary men of the time failed to profit from it. The great and romantic traditions associated with Weimar allured many of the younger minds, and in 1817 Lockhart also ventured abroad. He had then already some knowledge of German, for he had agreed, before his departure, to prepare a translation of Friedrich Schlegel's *Lectures on the History of Literature*, to be published by Blackwood.

In Germany, he heard Fichte lecture; but there is little in his subsequent work to show that he ever came under the sway of German idealism—except in a very vague way. It appeared to him too “fantastic and mystical.” His pilgrimage was to another shrine. He saw Goethe at Weimar and never forgot the impression made upon him by Germany's greatest poet. He was enraptured by “the sublime simplicity of his Homeric beauty—the awful pile of forehead—the large deep eyes, with their melancholy lightnings—the whole countenance, so radiant with divinity”;—he was enchanted by “the finest specimen of humanity” he had ever beheld.<sup>1</sup>

Lockhart emerged from Germany much enriched—as he had occasion to confess—by the German passion for high thinking, for self-education, and the “cultivation of the impersonal sentiments of the human mind.” His native idealism had been strengthened by a preoccupation with German poetry and German thought.<sup>2</sup> It was Goethe, however, who formed the central kernel of that influence. The “matchless union of reason and passion” which Goethe represented was embodied once and for all in *Faust*. This was the top of all of Goethe's works, and exhibited “almost every power necessary for the construction of perfect dramatic poetry.”<sup>3</sup> It was a thing by itself, a masterpiece of unquestionable moral power, placing its author in the first rank of creative genius.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Peter's Letters to His Kinsfolk*, 2 ed., Edinburgh and London, 1819, I, 54. In the preparation of these pages I have been in constant debt to M. Clive Hildyard's *Lockhart's Literary Criticism*, Oxford, 1931. Mr. Hildyard has been able, through an examination of unpublished correspondence, to establish Lockhart's authorship of a number of hitherto doubtful reviews.

<sup>2</sup> *Peter's Letters*, III, 137.

<sup>3</sup> *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, VI (1819), 121-22.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, XIV (1823), 377; *Quarterly Review*, XXXIV (1826), 138-39.

In his ardent discipleship, Lockhart is not unworthily anticipating the more critical, but scarcely more touching, reaction of Carlyle. For Lockhart saw Goethe's great significance for his age, saw in him a revitalized principle of affirmation and a triumphant answer to the negativism of Voltaire. Goethe came to represent a victory over that rationalism which stabbed—as Lockhart phrased it—at “the eternal foundations of morals,” and indiscriminately assaulted both “pretense and purity, cunning and wisdom.”<sup>5</sup> Hence Lockhart's zealous enthusiasm for *Goetz von Berlichingen* (which Scott had translated). It was “one of the most important landmarks in the history of German literature.”<sup>6</sup> But more than that, it was a vindication of medieval chivalry and honor (dear to both Scott and his son-in-law). “The lesson,” Lockhart concluded,

the great lesson to be derived from this drama . . . is simply this, that in spite of all the sneers of *philosophers*, the elements of virtue and excellence were predominant among those who formed the Gothic institutions of Europe; and, secondly, that in spite of all the outcry of demagogues, the modern world has been continually and progressively improving in everything that really concerns the well being of men and of societies.<sup>7</sup>

In those years of overpowering enthusiasm in the cause of Goethe, he seems to have lost sight of Schiller, uncritically rejecting *Wallenstein* and *William Tell* in favor of *Egmont*; setting all of Schiller's work far below *Faust*. But in 1823—the year, be it noted, of the first appearance of Carlyle's *Life of Schiller*—he was to amend his rash judgment, and in the drama, at least, “the real living drama of tragic action,” he was to accord Schiller primacy over Goethe, and proximity to Shakespeare himself.<sup>8</sup>

Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*, Lockhart regarded as one of the very best ‘philosophic romances’ to be found in European literature; but he was chilled by the rationalistic doctrine, to which earlier readers had responded so whole-heartedly, and which he felt did damage to its artistic integrity.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *Blackwood's*, xvi (1824), 370-71.

<sup>6</sup> *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott*, Boston and New York, 1901, I, 274.

<sup>7</sup> *Blackwood's*, xvi (1824), 372, 385.

<sup>8</sup> See F. Ewen, *The Prestige of Schiller in England*, New York, 1932, 116-17.

<sup>9</sup> *Blackwood's*, vi (1819), 121.

In the same year in which he gave utterance to his disparaging remarks on the genius of Schiller, he fell a prey to the hair-raising *Schauerromantik* of Adolph Müllner's fate-tragedy, *Guilt*. "What would we not give," he wrote in 1819, "to see such a genius among ourselves bestowing all the fine and free energies of his youth upon our own drama." Of the play he could scarcely say his fill. It seemed, he thought, to penetrate the inmost recesses of the human soul and to expose its hidden mysteries "so far as they can be revealed." Its ideas were great and beautiful; and its extraordinary achievement lay in its depiction of guilt, which does not arouse us to a disgust with the guilty hero. Its success in that respect made it a worthy peer of *Macbeth*, and of the tragedy of Ford and Webster.<sup>10</sup>

On the whole, he seemed to have a leaning toward the horrible, the extravagant, and the sentimental. He translated Fouqué's *The Pilgrimage*,<sup>11</sup> and was more than pleased with E. T. A. Hoffmann's *The Devil's Elixir* which he considered the best of Hoffmann's works,—an admirable fusion of realism and fantasy. He could not refrain from remarking that "lessons of great and serious importance" might be drawn from the personal and literary career of the extraordinary Romantic.<sup>12</sup>

In the realm of German criticism he roamed at ease and not without profit. We have already seen that his first venture was a translation of a critical work by Friedrich Schlegel. For August Wilhelm von Schlegel he had a profound respect, regarding him as perhaps the "first of all poetical translators, ancient or modern," and as a master of both English and German. The *Lectures on Dramatic Literature* was, he thought, a worthy rival of Madame Staël's *De l'Allemagne*.<sup>13</sup> But he felt that of the two brothers, Friedrich was "the more remarkable." Herder, however, was the preëminent German critic. Nothing that the elder Schlegel had written,—for that matter, nothing that had been produced in England,—could stand comparison with his remarks on English literature of the preceding age.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 122-23, 134.

<sup>11</sup> *Blackwood's* XII (1821), 481 ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, XVI (1824), 67.

<sup>13</sup> *Quarterly*, XXXIV (1826), 147; *Blackwood's* XIV (1823), 381.

<sup>14</sup> *Quarterly*, LV (1835), 22.

His discovery of Herder came late in life, apparently a chance result of his acquaintance with Heine's *De l'Allemagne*, in 1835. Lockhart's two reviews of Heine are among the earliest attempts to do that poet some measure of justice in England—scant enough in the light of Heine's true genius; but not inconsiderable when we take into account Lockhart's own shortcomings. He had turned with revulsion from Shelley's heretical principles and he could scarcely do less in the case of the German arch-mocker. It was tragic, he believed, that the nobility and generosity of which Heine was indisputably the possessor should have been perverted to foul ends. Heine was a man without faith. The victim of racial oppression, "he blends a rancorous personal spleen with the frigidities of the contemptuous metaphysician, and revives, in the apparent absence of all convictions, the bitter and sneering malignity of a crucifying Sadducee." One can account for, but scarcely condone, his "blasphemous audacities." A genius, no doubt; but one whose "varied and brilliant talents" had been sadly misapplied."<sup>15</sup>

With Heine, Lockhart ends his exploration of German letters. What had drawn him to it? What had he derived from it? He began his literary career in the years which re-echoed to Madame de Staël's epochal book. His relation with Sir Walter Scott no doubt served to strengthen his interest in German literature. Like so many men of letters of another generation, Lockhart was drawn by the *macabre* in German Romanticism. He, who had on one occasion thought that the "region of fear and terror" never could be exhausted, would not be likely to shrink from the *Schauerromantik* of Hoffman or Müllner. But he revolted from what he conceived to be a perverted use of horror in the interests of vice. Hence his frequent homilies. He praised in Scott a "firm healthiness of feeling," a "sustained and masculine purity of mental vigour." He believed he had found these qualities in Schiller and Goethe. That he remained indifferent to the moral implications of German idealistic philosophy is startling. But Lockhart's intel-

<sup>15</sup> *Quarterly*, LV (1835), 1-2, 34. This review is unquestionably from the pen of Lockhart (see Hildyard, 162). As it opens with the following words, "A few months ago, we offered our readers some specimens of the author's vein," I am led to ascribe the previous review (*Quarterly*, LIII, [1835]) to the same writer.

lect was not a philosophical one. It is much to his credit that he could liberate himself from Scott's very circumscribed view of Goethe's achievement. If his interest in German letters was—with perhaps one exception—wide rather than deep, it was inclusive. And it was eminently befitting that a literary pilgrimage which had begun with Goethe should be rewarded with a glimpse—unfortunately, only a glimpse—of the greatest German poet after Goethe.

FREDERIC EWEN

Brooklyn College

### EMERSON'S ADAPTATION OF A LINE FROM SPENSER

Emerson's poem "The Sphinx," originally printed in the *Dial* for January, 1841,<sup>1</sup> underwent considerable revision before it was republished in December, 1846, in the first collected volume of his verse.<sup>2</sup> One striking alteration was made in the taunt that the Poet hurls, by way of conclusion, at the Sphinx, whose riddle he believes he has solved. In the first version the passage read:

"Dull Sphinx, Jove keep thy five wits!  
Thy sight is growing blear;  
Hemlock and vitriol for the Sphinx  
Her muddy eyes to clear."<sup>3</sup>

To soften its harshness, Emerson changed the third of these lines to:

Rue, myrrh, and cummin for the Sphinx.

Most of the revising seems to have been done in the summer of 1846. Emerson's *Journals* for the same period, August or September, record a significant bit of reading:

Poets do not need to consider how fruitful the topic is, for with their superfluity of eyes every topic is opulent. Spenser seems to delight in his art for his own skill's sake. In the *Muiopotmos*, see the security and ostentation with which he draws out and refines his description of a butterfly's back and wings, of a spider's thread and spinning, of the Butterfly's Cruise among the flowers, "bathing his tender feet in the dew which yet

<sup>1</sup> I, 348-50.

<sup>2</sup> *Poems* (Boston, 1847), pp. 7-13. For date of publication see R. W. Emerson, *Journals*, ed. by E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes (10 vols., Boston, 1909-14), VII, 234.

<sup>3</sup> Lines 105-8.

on them does lie,"—it is all like the working of an exquisite loom which strongly and unweariedly yields fine webs, for exhibition, and defiance of all spinners.<sup>4</sup>

The clauses within Emerson's quotation marks are a telescoped paraphrase of lines 181-2 of Spenser's poem.<sup>5</sup> In the succeeding stanza, at verse 188, occurs the following:

Ranke smelling Rue, and Cummin good for eyes.

That this was the source of the revised line in Emerson's "Sphinx" is, I believe, a reasonable deduction.

The application of cummin for healing the eye forms, of course, the principal resemblance. Before a direct connection between the two lines can be demonstrated, however, the possibility of an independent source used by both Spenser and Emerson must be eliminated. This is not difficult. The Elizabethan poet probably drew his information either from Pliny the Elder or from Bartholomaeus Anglicus.<sup>6</sup> Emerson, on the other hand, was unacquainted with the latter, and apparently read the *Naturalis Historiae* of the former only in the translation of Bostock and Riley, which first appeared in 1855-57.<sup>7</sup> Except through such ancient treatises, knowledge of the ophthalmic use of cummin could not have reached

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, VII, 229-30.

<sup>5</sup> Or of the deaw, which yet on them does lie,  
Now in the same bathing his tender feete.

—*Muiopotmos: or The Fate of the Butterflie.*

<sup>6</sup> See note by W. L. Renwick in his edition of Spenser's *Complaints* (London, 1928), p. 253. To Renwick's citations should be added two others, giving a total of four possible sources, as follows: C. Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis Historiae*, lib. XX, cap. X, and cap. XIV; *Batman vppon Bartholome* [i. e., *Bartholomaeus Anglicus*], *His Booke De Proprietatibus Rerum* [translated by John de Trevisa] (London, 1582), folios 92 verso to 93 recto, and 285 verso.

<sup>7</sup> In Bohn's Classical Library. Emerson's direct allusions to Pliny are in "Works and Days," written in 1857 (See *Complete Works*, Centenary ed. VII, 179, 393, 398); and in the *Journals* for April, 1861, (IX, 323). The latter entry includes Emerson's own reference, "Bohn's translation, Vol. VI, p. 221 [incorrectly for 224]." The sentences from Pliny in the *Journals* (VII, 290) for June, 1847, are taken at third hand, Emerson borrowing from A. J. Downing, *The Fruits and Fruit Trees of America* (New York, 1845), p. 317, who in turn quotes J. C. Loudon, *Arboretum et Fruticetum Britannicum; or, the Trees and Shrubs of Britain* (2d ed., London, 1844), II, 882.



Emerson, for the medical lore, popular and professional, of his own time did not preserve even the tradition of this particular practice.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, Emerson showed his indebtedness conclusively when he placed rue in juxtaposition with cummin, exactly as Spenser had done.<sup>9</sup>

ARTHUR EUGENE BESTOR, JR.

*New Haven, Connecticut*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax. Ein Versuch zur Erforschung der Bedingungen und Triebkräfte in Syntax und Stilistik.* Von WILHELM HAVERS. Indogermanische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von H. Hirt und W. Streitberg.† Erste Abt., erste Reihe. Heidelberg: Winter, 1931.

This handbook of descriptive syntax avowedly confines itself to the treatment of concrete syntactic phenomena to the exclusion of theoretic speculation. According to the author's statement it is primarily intended for students and in consequence limits itself, in the main, to the languages ordinarily studied in the schools, although examples from Lithuanian, Sanscrit, Old Irish, and other less known languages frequently occur. To the scholar accustomed to see weighty and fairly exhaustive treatises by German scholars parade as 'Elementarbücher,' it will cause no surprise that the work turns out to be a very serious effort based on extensive collections for every phase of the subject treated. A list of the works frequently quoted precedes the text proper, which occupies pp. 1-208, and copious notes (pp. 209-270) accompany the various paragraphs and furnish a further detailed bibliography. The reader will be grateful that dates of publication are generally stated, enabling him

<sup>8</sup> In an examination of fourteen works on *materia medica*, including non-technical herbals, dating from 1694 to 1847, I have found no allusion whatever to the use of cummin for the eyes.

<sup>9</sup> Both Pliny (lib. xx, cap. xiii) and Bartholomaeus (folio 317 verso) found rue helpful to the vision, and Spenser probably had these authorities in mind when he linked the herb with cummin. Emerson followed Spenser, and showed that he was thinking poetically not medically when he added myrrh, for I have found no writer, ancient or modern, who ever suggested that the bitter gum should be used for the eyes.

to estimate the value of the numerous magazine articles quoted, to determine whether they are recent or not.

The arrangement of the material, always a crux in syntax, is effected in two main divisions (chapters): 'die Bedingungen,' the conditions (pp. 11-144), and 'die Triebkräfte,' the impelling forces (pp. 144-191), according to the principle that empirical syntax must describe the facts and explain them by establishing the conditions and impelling forces. Under 'Bedingungen' the author enumerates as subdivisions: conditions inherent firstly, in the external form of speech, secondly in the psycho-physical constitution of man (with further subdivisions, viz. conditions imposed by the folkpsyche, errors and their psychic basis, conditions of the environment, the latter again subdivided into natural, cultural and social environment). Lack of space forbids an enumeration of further subdivisions of this chapter. The second chapter: die 'Triebkräfte,' is divided into six sections: concreteness, emotional impulses, economy of expression, the sphere of social impulses. In a third chapter are treated the interlocking of 'Bedingungen' and 'Triebkräfte.' In this chapter the author confesses that his main division into 'Bedingungen' and 'Triebkräfte' is only a stopgap introduced for practical purposes. Indeed the principal value of the work lies in the ultimate subdivisions, which treat in a broad spirit, with copious examples from the well-known languages—English gets its fair share—problems of syntax, new and old.

The present reviewer would like to express his gratitude, after careful reading of every page, for the competent and instructive handling of the subject within the limits set and does not regret that the author has held aloof from a primary classification by parts of speech, cases &c., which by its rigidity distorts and hampers the pliant and fluid character of language, which should be respected in syntax.

May we expect at some time a type of treatment starting from the sentence as point of departure, a possibility that has been suggested, and that seems to hold out hope of better things for syntactical studies?

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

*New York University*

---

*Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1715-1789).* Par PIERRE TRAHARD. Tome III. Paris, 1932. Pp. 319.

In this volume, the third of his four-volume series, M. Trahard devotes his attention mainly to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Only the twelfth and final chapter is given over to the lesser figure of Julie de Lespinasse. The author brings to his study an intimate ac-

quaintance with the enormous bibliography of the subject, a close reading of the text of Rousseau himself, and above all a willingness to understand him. "Je ne cherche en Rousseau que l'expression de sa sensibilité," writes M. Trahard. "Loin de réduire ainsi la personnalité de l'homme, je l'embrasse dans son développement, je la saisis dans ses nuances" (p. 7). Interpreting his theme thus broadly and humanly, the author endeavors to put before us the whole man in all his infinite complexity. Rightly he rejects "telle méthode de critique, qui s'acharne à relever les contradictions de détail chez Rousseau en opposant les mots les uns aux autres." Such a method is "tâtillonne et fâcheuse, car elle fait perdre de vue l'ensemble" (p. 29, n. 1). To understand Rousseau, "il faut regarder l'homme vivre au contact permanent des choses, . . . sans oublier jamais la complexité des forces qui se heurtent en lui, et la puissance des forces extérieures qui le heurtent" (p. 59).

Years ago M. Lanson in a characteristically expressive sentence wrote in his *Histoire de la littérature française*: "Il a fallu que Rousseau fût supérieurement moral, pour n'avoir pas mal fini, après ses commencements" (p. 790). Similarly M. Trahard says: "On insiste trop sur les faiblesses et les fautes de Jean-Jacques; on ne met pas assez en lumière ce constant effort vers la perfection morale, ce besoin de vertu qui s'impose à lui aux heures de passion" (pp. 150-51). Likewise in another passage the author comments: "Aussi les moralistes en chambre ont-ils le tort d'accabler Rousseau sous le poids de ses fautes et de ses vices. . . . Il suffit que Jean-Jacques puise dans sa propre déchéance le goût du perfectionnement, de la maîtrise de soi, et réalise péniblement cette réforme" (pp. 224-25). Deeply human in his weakness and in his struggles, Rousseau but speaks of conduct with more authority out of the laboratory of his own experience. It is curious that there has been more of a tendency to question the sincerity of his moral growth than in the case of other tormented spirits before him. As M. Trahard says, "on peut ne pas l'aimer, on doit lui rendre justice" (p. 257). No doubt in the interpretation of any historical or literary figure some subjective element must enter. That is no less true of critics hostile to Rousseau than of those favorable to him. Frankly M. Trahard observes: "J'ignore, en définitive, si je crois comprendre Rousseau, parce que je l'aime, ou si je l'aime, parce que je crois le comprendre" (p. 258).

It is impossible in brief space to do justice to this book, which is rich in pertinent citation and illuminating comment. The point of view of course is not as a whole new. Other competent scholars have presented similar interpretations of Rousseau's personality and of his ideas. Nevertheless, this is a new synthesis written with vigor and conviction and thoroughly supported by documentation. No one interested in Rousseau can afford to neglect it.

*Louis Ménard (1822-1901)*. By HENRI PEYRE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932. Pp. 605. \$3.50.

A more appropriate writer of secondary character could hardly have been chosen for depicting the complex interests of the second half of the nineteenth century in France than the versatile Ménard. In order to search for the origin of his ideas, to examine his solid erudition and to determine his originality and influence, it was necessary to delve into the fields of history, politics, art, philosophy, and religion. M. Peyre, with his excellent training as a Normalien, proved himself equal to this task and has written a very valuable book for the historian of social and political theories, religions, Hellenism, mysticism, and the literature of the Parnasse.

The attention is focused, of course, on Ménard: his life, the source and evolution of his work, the influence of his personality and ideas. At the time M. Peyre was preparing his study, Ménard was receiving attention as a contributor to the Parnasse (M. Souriau, *Hist. du Parnasse*, part IV, pp. 163-175) and to the Hellenic sentiment of this school (F. Desonay, *Le Rêve Hellénique chez les Poètes Parnassiens*, pp. 69-117). M. Peyre's work shows, especially in the penetrating chapter, *L'influence de Ménard*, the inadequacy of the two chapters of Desonay and Souriau, and proves, to this reviewer at least, that the lacunae are still too evident for an accurate appreciation of so recent a literary movement.

In spite of a comprehensive bibliography<sup>1</sup> and a conscientious and searching presentation, M. Peyre's book suffers from the objectionable feature of over-expansion. This over-expansion is due to a lack of terseness in M. Peyre's style, and to the character of Ménard's work. Ménard, after vacillating between poetry, painting, and chemistry seems to find himself, and reaches his literary and philosophical climax around 1860 with the second edition of his thesis *De la morale avant les philosophes* and the publication of *Du Polythéisme hellénique*. From then on this Hellenist spends his time meditating upon and restating his cherished themes: polytheism, religious syncretism, cult of the dead, aversion to progress, etc., etc. M. Peyre fully appreciates this when he writes on p. 369: "mais il n'avait rien à ajouter aux livres où, dix ans plus tôt, il

<sup>1</sup> Naturally, in a book so formidable as M. Peyre's, a few omissions can always be found. In the discussion of M's mythological theories the importance of O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie* should be taken into account; reference to Nilsson's *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* would have avoided, on p. 237, the irrelevant remark: "Nos arrière-petits-fils riront à leur tour de notre savoir archéologique, de nos idées sur les Crétois . . ." A recent Columbia dissertation is enlightening on religious syncretism: C. H. Kraeling, *Anthropos and Son of man; a study in the religious syncretism of the Hellenistic Orient*; and for Hellenistic Egypt in general, reference to W. Schubart, *Ägypten von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf Mohammed* is missing.

avait mis le meilleur de lui-même en exposant son hellénisme"—with one exceptional masterpiece, the *Légende de Saint-Hilarion*. This repetition, characteristic in Ménard, leads to iteration and confusion in the work of one who is studying him, and it is regrettable that M. Peyre did not terminate his study with a strong chapter of conclusions—conclusions of which he has proved himself so capable when dealing with the influence of Ménard on Banville, Leconte de Lisle, Renouvrier, Anatole France, Barrès, etc. This criticism should not detract from the scholarly contribution of M. Peyre. He may safely be congratulated on having written a work of great value and importance for the literary historian of the nineteenth century, and we shall await with pleasant anticipation the history he has promised us on Hellenism in France during the nineteenth century and for which he has prepared an accurate and complete bibliography.<sup>2</sup>

EMILE MALAKIS

University of Pennsylvania

*Qu'est-ce que le Classicisme? Essai de Mise au Point.* PAR HENRI PEYRE. Paris: Droz, 1933. Pp. 231.

M. Peyre, as his subtitle temperately suggests, favors clear outline. Widely read, intellectually hospitable, supple, he nevertheless approaches strict formula, and we presently understand why he calls the earlier study of Sainte-Beuve (who used the indefinite article in *Qu'est-ce qu'un classique?*) "fuyant" (p. 11) and "déroutant" (p. 28).

The two writers are admirably complementary. SB. wants an enlarged conception of classicism and is as inclusive as Mr. P. E. More when the latter groups an epigram of the Greek anthology, a Japanese *tanka*, a song of Ben Jonson, and a line of Goethe. For M. Peyre, it seems at moments, the only pure classicism is the purely French classicism of the Paris generation of 1660-1690. P. is not parochial, yet there is a faint reminiscence of the attitude which made Voltaire ready to consider *Athalie* "le chef d'œuvre de l'esprit humain," forever matchless.<sup>1</sup> But P.'s own position shifts, perhaps a little more than he first intended, and at the end, when he speaks of "les hautes régions où la vérité et la beauté trônent au-dessus de nos querelles de village et de nation" (p. 194), he is closer than seemed possible at the start to SB.'s determination not to "scinder le genre humain."

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliographie Critique de l'Hellénisme en France 1843 à 1870*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932. 230 pp.

<sup>1</sup> We even remember Mme Dacier writing in 1714 of Corruption of Taste: "Quand les règles d'un art ont une fois été trouvées . . ."

P. is fresh and stimulating. Good points: the replacing of the simplistic term *rationalisme* by *intellectualité* (p. 55); the impropriety of identifying French classicism with mere regulation (p. 76); the danger of considering French classical writers "professeurs de vertu" (p. 90); the limitations of the debt to antiquity (p. 98); the Bibliography of 183 items, many recent, a list indispensable to students of literature. A learned and distinguished book.

HORATIO SMITH

*Brown University*

---

Eugen Schnell, *Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole "Incendium Amoris" und "Emendatio Vitae" und deren Übersetzung durch Richard Misyn*. Borna-Leipzig: Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske, 1932. Pp. vi + 191.

During the last half-dozen years our information about Richard Rolle has increased enormously, thanks mainly to Miss Hope E. Allen's monumental *Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle* (1927) and to its "pendent" *English Writings of Richard Rolle* (1931). The English works are accessible, but the Latin tracts remain, for the most part, in manuscript or early printed editions. The *Incendium Amoris* alone is available in a recent edition (ed. M. Deanesly, Manchester, 1915). This work, which is one of the most important documents for the study of Rolle's spiritual development, was translated, along with the *Emendatio Vitae*, by Richard Misyn in the years 1434-1435. There are several modernizations of Misyn, made, usually, for devotional reasons.

The *Incendium* is, then, by no means unknown, and we have here a new study. Dr. Schnell's book is divided into two parts. In the first section, after a brief notice of Rolle's life and a discussion of the texts and sources, he analyzes the two tracts, naturally drawing most of his material from the *Incendium*, with regard to Rolle's personal experience. This analysis is somewhat disappointing in that the reader frequently feels that the work is far more derivative than it should be. Numerous, and often very lengthy, quotations from Rolle are to be expected, but too often we seem to be reading an annotated anthology of what others have written about Rolle. The author is dependent on Horstmann and Miss Allen, for his knowledge of the bulk of Rolle's writings other than the two tracts under discussion. There is perhaps some excuse for not utilizing, say, his *Melum Contemplativorum* about which Miss Allen makes the rather despondent remark, "It is almost as difficult to read as it must have been to write, and since the close of the Middle Ages it has probably been read through only twice—by Horstmann and the present writer" (*English Writings*, p. xxxv), but we have a right to expect more references to the English works.

We are greatly interested in Rolle's revelations, especially those which deal with his personal experiences. It is all too evident that his way of life led to the making of enemies, both personal and ecclesiastical, and his bewilderment at the nature of some of the charges made against him would be amusing were it not pathetic: "Ideo si hilares sumus et iocundi, impii nos dicunt dissolutos, si tristes, dicunt ipocritas" (*Incendium Amoris*, ed. Deanesly, p. 170). In the same passage he praises the laughter that springs from clear conscience and spiritual happiness. Here we find the main-spring of Rolle's religious life—his was a joy, which is really physical as well as spiritual, in communion and union with God.

Another striking factor in Rolle's physical and spiritual life is his feeling toward women. He was both fascinated and repelled by the sex. Early in life he rejected sex as such but he was unable to live apart from women. He had at least four patronesses, with whom he disagreed, and it may well have been his desire to inspire women which led him to compose in English, for, like Pertelote, most fourteenth century women needed to have "the sentence of this Latin" expounded to them.<sup>1</sup> He was not interested in learning, he disliked scholastic philosophy, and most ecclesiastics were abhorrent to him. Dr. Schnell quotes and comments on these and other points of interest in the *Incendium* and the *Emendatio*, but it is better and easier to read the quotations in their original context and, unfortunately, the comments are not always illuminating.

The second part of the book is of more value. In point of fact it constitutes an introduction to Misyn's translations, which may well be substituted for Harvey's unsatisfactory preface to the edition in the Early English Text Society. The language of the translations shows dialect mixture, and after a full and competent study, Dr. Schnell concludes that Misyn was born near the Scottish border, probably in Cumberland, but that his translations were copied by a Lincolnshire scribe,<sup>2</sup> who, while familiar with the Northern dialect, on occasion lapsed into his own. Dr. Schnell goes on to discuss the translations as such, with many and interesting examples of Misyn's method and occasional misunderstanding. He thinks more highly of Misyn's style than does Miss Allen (*Writings*, p. 209), though when she calls it "awkward" she is not far from the truth. It is a pity that Dr. Schnell was not able (cf. p. 181, note 6) to consult the Worcester translation of the *Emendatio* printed by W. H. Hulme [Western Reserve University Bulletins, Literary Section, 1, 4 (1918)], since this anonymous rendering is far superior to Misyn's in freedom and lucidity.

Harvard University

B. J. WHITING

<sup>1</sup> We may note that Misyn made his translation for a "Syster Margarete," and that four of the five principal modern students of Rolle have been women.

<sup>2</sup> Misyn, when he made his translation, was prior of a Carmelite monastery at Lincoln.

*The Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England.* By Sister Mary of the Incarnation Byrne. Diss. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1932. Pp. xxxvi + 236.

The author of this dissertation tells us that "The discrepancy between the nun of fact and the nun of modern English literature suggests the possibility of a study of the latter. But the presence of a powerful tradition is so evidently informing all modern instances that a study of the source of this tradition is an obvious preliminary task" (p. xxix). For this purpose she has carried her researches into a truly vast amount of medieval literature, directing them in general to a study of the problem in England, but not by any means confining her field there. Didactic, historical, romantic, satirical, and narrative literature in Latin, French, and English has furnished her with material; and her bibliography is impressive. The result is an amazingly rich and detailed analysis of the traditional idea of the nun written by a modern religious whose learning is extensive and whose method is usually sound. "Underlying the sentimental nun-figure of Arthurian romance, the debased nun-figure of satire, and the mechanical nun-figure of most exempla is the traditional ideal nun-type of patristic Latin and of the religious-didactic literature of England. This form it is that issues from the period of literary beginnings in England into modern literature" (p. 228). Such in brief is her conclusion. Her special interest is obviously different from that of the social and economic study of Miss Eileen Power, whose procedure is less formal and more varied but suggests that gossip is a weapon against dullness.

The present investigation shows effectively the Christian character of prequest English literature. It gives idealistic and realistic pictures of the nun all through the Middle Ages, and the principles by which the type was established. Monastic abuses are not neglected, although one may feel that the proportion of attention devoted to the subject is as insufficient as that which Coulton gives to monastic virtues. Here one would hardly suspect the great abundance of material on moral lapses of the religious which Dr. Coulton is able to present in his studies. But anyone who knows the field can make the adjustment, and it is just as well to get the other side of the argument. Less comprehensible is the relegation of Madame Eglantine to a footnote because, we are told, Chaucer's portrayal is "photographic." Doubtless the satirical element has been overemphasized by modern critics, although Lowes in *Convention and Revolt in Poetry* manages the question with a delicacy that would bring no shame to the Prioress herself. Yet the modern nun should feel that too ardent a defense of her spiritual sister keeps the question alive. The Prioress's own conduct on the pilgrimage and the nature of her story bear better witness.



For the rest one may observe that the Bibliography is occasionally inaccurate or deficient. Signs are not wanting that the author had much too large a field to "ere"—as when she mentions seriously (p. 18) the attribution of the *Court of Love* to Chaucer, and (p. 14) omits to mention Klaeber's summary of the problem of the Christian element in the *Beowulf*, and (p. 44) uses an old edition of the *Pearl*. One may question her inferences at times—as in her remark that "Everything in the Gerbert addition related of the *Chastel as Puceles* justifies the interpretation of it as a nunnery . . ." (p. 146). Maidenland, however, may have been thus euhemerized! Misprints are surprisingly few, and the index is competent. One may hope that Sister Mary of the Incarnation may herself be the one to study the "discrepancy between the nun of fact and the nun of modern English literature."

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

---

*The Sources of the Court of Sapience.* By CURT FERDINAND BÜHLER. Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Heft. 23. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1932. Pp. 95.

The *Court of Sapience*, written about 1475, is a comprehensive literary mosaic compiled from many sources. The unknown author who may possibly have been George Ashby succeeded in collecting a vast amount of information which went to make up this long, uninspired poem of 2310 lines. These essential facts are presented in Doctor Bühler's exhaustive study of the sources of the *Court of Sapience*.

It is a pleasure to consider this work as a wholesome exception to the usual run of "source" studies which so often abound in forced parallelisms and unconvincing conclusions. Mr. Bühler admits that most of the ideas found in the *Court* have numerous echoes in the philosophico-religious literature of the Middle Ages. It is the distinct contribution of this study to lay open not only the immediate sources of the *Court* which are few, but also the ultimate sources which are many, comprising a veritable treasury of little-known Latin tracts and treatises. The research of Hope Traver relative to the Four Daughters of God is expanded and completed; we are told that the author of the *Court* need not have had access to Nicholas Love's translation of the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*. The affinity between the *Court* and Greban's popular *Mystère*, itself a modification of Deguillville's *Le Pelerinage Jhesucrist*, is significant; as are similarities discovered with various versions of Grosse-teste's *Castel off Love* from which it is probable that the plot of the *Court* is drawn (P. 11). The natural history section of the poem rests primarily on *De Proprietatibus Rerum* of Bartholomew

Anglicus. Perhaps the most useful chapter of the book comprises a history of medieval education which is brief and complete, and no less highly illuminative of the castle of Sapience and the Seven Sisters. A single instance of verbal obscurities cleared up will suffice. The name Regulus in stanza 322, which completely mystified Spindler, is explained as a reference to the miracle of the King's son "Et erat quidem regulus, etc." (John iv, 46-50). There is no allusion to the origin of the phrase "Quicumque vult" in stanza 321. This is a probable reference to the opening lines "Quicumque vult salvus esse" of the classic Symbolum of St. Athanasius which is an account of the necessary articles of faith much in the manner of this portion of the *Court*.

The second chapter is somewhat marred by continual references to the spurious works of Bonaventura without apprising the reader of their real or questioned authorship. The *Meditationes Vitae Christi*, for example, which is a primal source for the allegory of the Four Daughters, is a mystical biography of Christ by an unknown theologian, probably a Franciscan, in the thirteenth century. In an avowed study of its sources, one would expect a more definite notion of the nature of Sapience; not, however, as the personage found in Court of Love writings, but rather as Sapientia was popularly conceived in the treatises of such medieval mystics as Bernard, the Victorines, Bonaventura, and their numerous disciples whose writings are special concern of students of the *Court of Sapience*. Among these, one feels, the character of Sapience received its essential qualities. She is not merely an "attribute of the son" nor "a union of human and divine wisdom," but rather a personification of the Knowledge resident in the Deity conceived as a divine attribute irrespective of the Trinity of persons, and only arrived at or participated in by the devout mind through mystical contemplation. Doctor Bühler does not include linguistic or authorship problems in this study; nevertheless, it is a work which will be regarded by scholars as a *terminus a quo* for subsequent research into the sources of other medieval poems of this genre.

JOSEPH BURNS COLLINS

Baltimore, Maryland

---

*Browning and the Twentieth Century: A Study of Robert Browning's Influence and Reputation.* By A. ALLEN BROCKINGTON. London: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. 303. \$4.00.

This book is a thesis approved by the University of London, published at its expense by the Oxford University Press, and written by a clergyman who is also a lecturer in extension at Cambridge University. But the expectations aroused by such an un-

usual constellation of circumstances are not fulfilled. Mr. Brockington merely restates the Victorian interpretation of Browning's philosophy. Browning is valuable not as the psychologist of love but as a religious mystic. The only concession to novelty Mr. Brockington admits is the occasional vagueness of his optimism.

He did not condemn the Now—in fact, few poets have believed more in its possibilities—but the greater glory of the Now is the hope of the Forever. Sometimes the Forever seems uncertain, and yet he finds a use in uncertainty. His belief in immortality was liable to fluctuate; his belief in life was steady. (p. 32)

Browning's vagueness is obviously easier for the author to reproduce than to penetrate. Its influence had led him to include this philosophical comment in a chapter entitled, "Browning and his Art." But he finds that Browning's followers in the twentieth century have usually borrowed not his optimism but what is called his "conversational method." Hence there follow accounts of the lives and poetry of Kipling, Masfield, Davies, Housman, and numerous others, whose relation to Browning is in most instances either tenuous or untenable. Whatever scholarly process lurks in these references may be illustrated by the following proof of the influence upon Conrad.

*Youth* corresponds to *Porphyria's Lover*, in that it is nearer to the direct narrative form than the later dramatic pieces of Browning. When we come to Conrad's first really successful novel, *Chance*, we may perhaps be led to the conclusion that he consciously adopted Browning's method for his purpose. (p. 137)

A footnote bespeaks caution: "Such conclusions are always challengeable." When one turns to critical (as opposed to scholarly) interpretations, the explanation of *My Last Duchess* will scarcely supercede Mr. Berdoo's.

A jealous laborer, if he had had the same opportunity, might have treated his wife in the same way as Ferrara treated his duchess. Browning, however, does not as a rule make villains out of laborers. (p. 43)

One can hardly exaggerate the disorganization of the book, the triteness of its point of view, the absurdity of its opinions, and the weight of irrelevant material which is almost sufficient to turn it into an anthology of twentieth-century poetry. It is a disgrace to every party concerned with its publication.

EDWIN BERRY BURGUM

Washington Square College,  
New York University

---

*Shorthand Letters of Samuel Pepys.* Transcribed and edited by  
EDWIN CHAPPELL. Cambridge: at the University Press;  
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933. Pp. xv + 104. \$2.75.

This book includes all the shorthand letters—fifty-seven in number—from a manuscript volume from which Dr. J. R. Tanner selected a large portion of the longhand material, which he published in *Further Correspondence of Samuel Pepys*. Though the title of the manuscript volume—"S. Pepys' Official Correspondence 1662-1679"—does not properly indicate the nature of the contents of the whole volume, as we learn by looking into Tanner's *Further Correspondence*, it does very well for the group of letters in the present selection, which is filled for the most part with letters to Lord Sandwich, Sir William Coventry, Sir George Carteret, and others connected with the naval and state affairs at the time of the Dutch War. All but one of these communications fall in the years 1664-1668, just at the time when Pepys was recording his daily actions and thoughts in the *Diary*. The shorthand letters as well as the *Diary* indicate that Pepys is on friendly terms with these gentlemen, as his frequent inquiries into their well-being, even when the letters were mainly of an "official" character, show. We are gratified to learn in a letter to Sir William Penn that Mrs. Pepys' dog Batterton is well. As a rule, however, the *Shorthand Letters* have to do, as Mr. Chappell tells us in his preface, with "Appointments, recommendations, hiring of ships, victualling, prize-goods and convoys," and various other smaller matters such as, "papers, pens, candles and fire for Commissioner Taylor." But beneath these practical discussions of victualling and supplies, one perceives the real distress of the public-spirited Pepys as to the sad condition of the English navy at the time when the Dutch actually sailed up the Medway.

Mr. Chappell's method as an editor is helpful. Since the letters here printed are partly in longhand and partly in shorthand, the editor has used italics to indicate the longhand words and sentences and has printed the shorthand in roman type. This enables the reader to realize that Pepys did not use shorthand for secrecy but merely to save time in copying, for one sees at once that there is no real difference between the material italicized and that in roman print. Before each letter there is a note which places the letter in relation to Pepys' other work and to the affairs of the time. There is also a convenient calendar of the letters included in the volume, as well as a good index to all the persons, places and ships mentioned in the text. Mr. Chappell is to be congratulated on his work.

RUDOLF KIRK

## BRIEF MENTION

*Honoré de Balzac. A Force of Nature.* By EDWIN PRESTON DARGAN. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1932. Pp. 87. \$1.00. Voici un de ces livres comme il y en a trop peu: un ouvrage d'initiation qui n'est point un ouvrage de vulgarisation et qui, sous une forme claire, lisible et pleine d'enthousiasme représente de longues années de recherches patientes et d'obscurs labeurs. A tous ceux qui veulent étudier Balzac, à ceux qui simplement ont été pris dans le vertigineux tourbillon de la *Comédie humaine* et cherchent à faire le point, à tous les amis de Balzac, cette série de cinq essais où chaque paragraphe contient la substance d'un livre sera un guide indispensable. De tous les aspects multiples du génie de Balzac, M. Dargan a choisi celui qui s'impose avec l'évidence la plus claire: la force. Là Balzac est incomparable en effet. Plus encore que Chateaubriand il a traversé son siècle comme un brillant météore, et je ne chicanerai point le critique de l'avoir placé au-dessus non seulement de ses contemporains mais de ses successeurs et de ne lui trouver comme pairs que Rabelais et Cervantes. On sera cependant surpris de voir attribuer le même rang à Lesage; le sec et spirituel auteur de *Gil Blas* serait bien dépaycé en cette compagnie. Peut-être conviendrait-il également de faire des réserves sur quelques points de détail. Si M. Bouteron a pu être plaisamment surnommé le "Pape des Balzaciens," M. Dargan a droit au moins au titre de "Vicaire Apostolique" dans le *Nouveau Monde*. Il va même plus loin que le savant conservateur de la collection Lovenjoul dans une admiration intégrale qui s'étend jusqu'aux taches et aux "verrues" de l'auteur. Il y a en effet des "thrills" dans les romans de Balzac; mais l'on peut l'aimer sans chérir particulièrement la tentative d'enlèvement de la duchesse de Langeais, ni l'épisode où l'on voit Lucien écrivant des chansons grivoises près du lit de mort de sa maîtresse pour payer l'enterrement de la pauvre fille. Ici M. Dargan semble bien avoir subi la magie d'un auteur qui "a le secret de faire paraître l'extraordinaire" par "une étrange transmutation des molécules." Ne pourrait-on aussi bien reconnaître qu'il y a chez Balzac du roman feuilleton et du pire, et que ses défauts sont souvent aussi démesurés, mais heureusement moins fréquents que les manifestations de son génie?

GILBERT CHINARD

*Buffon et l'Agrandissement du Jardin du Roi à Paris.* By WILLIAM FRANKLIN FALLS. University of Pennsylvania Dissertation. Philadelphia, 1933. Pp. 6-79. 12 plates. La première partie du

travail de M. Falls qui lui a valu d'être accepté pour publication dans les *Archives du Muséum* (Sixième série, X-17) apporte des précisions fort intéressantes sur un des chapitres les plus curieux de la vie de Buffon, et sur la passion avec laquelle, de 1739 à 1777, il perfectionna, transforma et enfin élargit l'établissement fort modeste qu'il avait trouvé au moment de sa nomination au poste d'Intendant du Jardin du Roi. Comme le remarque justement M. Falls, sans le Jardin, Buffon n'aurait probablement pas écrit l'*Histoire Naturelle* et son œuvre d'administrateur est étroitement liée à son œuvre de naturaliste. Dans la seconde partie, consacrée à "Buffon homme d'affaires," l'auteur a étudié et discuté les procédés employés par Buffon pour arriver à ses fins, et le montre comme un fonctionnaire soucieux de se concilier l'appui des gens en place et assez peu préoccupé des droits des petites gens qu'il faisait exploier. Bien qu'on ne puisse l'accuser de malhonnêteté, il résulte au moins de cette enquête que l'Intendant du Jardin n'aurait point respecté le moulin du meunier de Sans-Souci. Il est fort difficile de juger à distance de tels procès dont la plupart des pièces ont disparu; mais les conclusions de M. Falls paraissent justes et modérées et révèlent un côté peu connu du caractère de Buffon.

GILBERT CHINARD

*Maria Jane Jewsbury*: Occasional Papers, Selected with a Memoir. By ERIC GILLET. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932. Pp. lxxvii + 108. \$2.00. M. J. J.'s connection with the Wordsworth family has saved her sprightly writings from total obscurity. An older sister of Mrs. Carlyle's friend Geraldine Jewsbury, Maria Jane dedicated her first book of sketches and tales, *Phantasmagoria* (1825), to Wordsworth, and later visited the Wordsworths at Rydal Mount. The poet had a "high opinion of her head and heart" and made her figure in two of his less successful poems. Dorothy found one of her stories so "affectingly told" that she suggested to Crabb Robinson that he review the volume or at least ask Charles Lamb to "slip a notice into one of the magazines."

Mr. Gillet has written a brief Memoir (an extension of two articles in the *Times* and the *London Mercury*) and has printed for the first time, in an appendix, Miss Jewsbury's *Kent's Bank Mercury*, a delightfully humorous family newspaper, in which Dorothy probably had a hand, giving an account of the Wordsworths at Morecambe Bay in July 1825. The major portion of the slender volume consists of prose selections from only the *Phantasmagoria*. None of her rather indifferent verse scattered among numerous annuals has been included.

GORDON H. HARPER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Aiken, Janet Rankin. — A New Plan of English Grammar. *New York*: Henry Holt, 1933. Pp. viii + 216. \$1.40.

Brown, Edith Morrow. — The Influence of the Bible on Wordsworth's Diction. Abstract of a Dissertation presented to Cornell University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, February, 1934. Pp. 5.

Department of English, University of California. — Essays in Criticism (Second series). *Berkeley*: University of California Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 270. (Univ. of Cal. Pub. in Eng., Vol. IV.)

Gollancz, Sir Israel. — Cleanness, Glossary and Illustrative Texts. *London*: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. 102. 5s. (Select Early English Poems, IX.)

Loggins, Vernon. — Visual Outline of American Literature. *New York*: Longmans, Green and Company, 1933. Pp. 110. \$0.75. (Students Outline Series.)

Moore, Mina. — Bernard Shaw et la France. *Paris*: Honoré Champion, 1933. Pp. 220. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, 97.)

More, Paul Elmer. — Irving Babbitt. Reprinted from the University of Toronto Quarterly, III, January, 1934. Pp. 129-145.

Oertel, Hans Joachim. — George Berkeley und die Englische Literatur. *Halle (Saale)*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. viii + 146. M. 6. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXX.)

Page, Frederick. — Patmore: A Study in Poetry. *London*: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. 184. \$2.25.

Plessow, Gustav L. — Das Amerikanische Kurzschauspiel zwischen 1910 und 1930. *Halle (Saale)*: Niemeyer, 1933. Pp. viii + 272. M. 10. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXXIII.)

Spargo, John Webster. — Virgil the Necromancer: Studies in Virgilian Legends. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 502. \$5.00. (Harvard University Studies in Comparative Literature, X.)

Stewart, Herbert L. — The Montaigne Quater-Centenary. Reprinted from the University of Toronto Quarterly, III, January, 1934. Pp. 208-227.

Yeats, William Butler. — Letters to the New Island, edited by Horace Reynolds. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 224. \$2.50.

## GERMAN

Bielfeldt, Hans Holm. — Lautlehre der deutschen Lehnwörter im Obersorbischen. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin*: 1933. 86 pp.

Drama, Das deutsche, in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Hrsg. von Richard Elsner. Jg. 5, 1933. *Berlin*: Heyer [1933]. 343 pp. M. 5.

Evans, M. B., and Röseler, R. O. — Das Rheinland. Easy Readings. *New York*: Crofts, 1934. viii, 202 pp. \$1.25.

Frise, Adolf. — Alexander Jung eine monographische Studie als Beitrag zur Geschichte der idealistischen eklektischen Literatur in der Mitte des 19. Jhs. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 100 pp.

Heinsohn, Wilhelm. — Das Eindringen der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache in Lübeck während des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. [Veröffentlichungen zur Gesch. der Freien und Hansestadt Lübeck, Hrsg. vom Staatsarchiv zu Lübeck. Bd. 12]. *Lübeck*: Staatsarchiv, 1933. xvii, 198 pp. 4°.

Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1934 Hrsg. vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum. *Leipzig*: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 242 pp.

Hirt, H. — Handbuch des Urgermanischen. Teil III. Abriss der Syntax. [Indogerm. Bibl. 1. Abt. 1. Reihe: Grammatiken. 21. Bd.] *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. xii, 231 pp. M. 6.50.

Hoffmann, K. E. — Basler Dichterstätten. Im Auftrag der Kommission zur Förderung des heimischen Schrifttums in Basel herausgegeben. *Basel*: Schwabe, 1934. 71 pp. M. 2.25.

Jost, Theodor. — Mechanisierung des Lebens und moderne Lyrik. [Mnemosyne, H. 16]. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. 148 pp. M. 4.20.

Karschin, Anna Luise. — Die Karschin, Friedrichs des Grossen Volksdichterin. Ein Leben in Briefen. Eingeleitet und hrsg. von Elisabeth Hausmann. Mit 31 Bildern. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Societäts-Verl., 1933. 409 pp. M. 6.

Lenhartz, Rolf. — Die lyrische Einlage bei Theodor Storm, ihr künstlerischer Sinn im Aufbau der Novelle. Diss. *Bonn*. 1933. 111 pp.

Luginbühl, Emil. — Studien zu Notkers Übersetzungskunst. Diss. *Zürich*. *Weida i. Thür.*: Thomas & Hubert, 1933. 139 pp.

Mast, Hans. — Stilistische Untersuchungen an den Kleinen Gedichten des Strickers mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des volkstümlichen und des formelhaften Elementes. Diss. *Basel*. *Wien*: 1933.

Maurer, Friedrich. — Volkssprache. Abhandlungen über Mundarten und Volkskunde. Zugleich eine Einführung in die neueren Forschungsweisen [Fränkische Forschungen. 1.]. *Erlangen*: Palm & Enke, 1933. x, 135 pp. 4°. M. 5.

Michel, Max.—Die Volkssage bei Abraham a Sancta Clara. [Form und Geist. Bd. 31]. *Leipzig*: Eichblatt, 1933. 73 pp. M. 3.50.

Mörke, Eduard.—Mozart on the way to Prague. Translated by Walter and Catherine Alison Philips. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1934. xx, 104 pp. 5s.

Reier, Herbert.—Syntaktische Beziehungen zwischen Nord- und Südgermanisch. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 153 pp. 4<sup>5</sup>.

Roedl, Urban.—Matthias Claudius. Sein Weg und seine Welt. *Berlin*: K. Wolff, 1934. 415 pp. M. 3.75.

Ruoff, Wilhelm.—Goethe und die Ausdruckskraft des Wortes. Eine Untersuchung des typischen Sprachgebrauchs im "West-östlichen Divan." Diss. *Leipzig*: 1933. 78 pp.

Saemann, Edith.—J. G. Hamann und die französische Literatur. Diss. *Königsberg*: 1933. 142 pp.

Sapper, Agnes.—Die Familie Pfäffling. Eine deutsche Wintergeschichte. Ed. by Bertha Reed Coffman and Henrietta Littlefield. *New York*: Crofts, 1934. xi, 229 pp. \$1.35.

Schmid-Jürgens, Erna Ines.—Ida Gräfin Hahn-Hahn. (Diss. München.) [Germanische Studien. H. 144]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 123 pp. M. 4.80.

Schurig, Walther.—Das Prinzip der Abstufung im deutschen Vers. Zur Struktur der deutschen Verssprache. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. 79 pp. M. 4.

Sickel, Karl-Ernst.—Johann Christoph Adelung, seine Persönlichkeit und seine Geschichtsauffassung. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1933. 231 pp.

Siebert, Johannes.—Der Dichter Tannhäuser. Leben-Gedichte-Sage. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. viii, 249 pp. M. 10.

Stadtländer, Wilhelm.—Börne und sein Verhältnis zu Goethe und Jean Paul. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1933. 159 pp.

Sudheimer, Hellmuth.—Der Geniebegriff des jungen Goethe. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin*: 1933. 58 pp.

Voigt, Günther.—Die humoristische Figur bei Jean Paul. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. 97 pp. M. 3.50.

Wittmann, Alfred.—Die Gestalt der Hexe in der deutschen Sage. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 106 pp.

#### FRENCH

Aimon de Varennes.—Florimont, herausgegeben von A. Hilka. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. cxlii + 640 pp.

Auerbach, E.—Das franz.: Publikum des 17. Jh. *Munich*: Hueber, 1933. 53 pp.

Barras, M.—The Stage Controversy in Fr. from Corneille to Rousseau. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933. 358 pp.

Benedetto, L.-F.—Indiscrétions sur Giulia (un amour de Stendhal). *Paris*: Le Divan, 1934. 190 pp. Fr. 18.

Boileau.—Épîtres et Art poétique, éd. J. Griveaud. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1934. 132 pp.

Chrétien de Troyes.—Cligès, ed. H. Breuer. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. viii + 79 pp. M. 2. (Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte.)

Cyrano du Bergerac.—Œuvres diverses, éd. Lachèvre. *Paris*: Garnier, 1933. ii + 386 pp. Fr. 12.

Dähne, R.—Die Lieder der Maumariée seit dem Mittelalter. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. xii + 203 pp.

Dechamps, J.—Chateaubriand en Angleterre. *Paris*: Edit. Albert, 1934. 210 pp. Fr. 12.

Delhorbe, C.—L'Affaire Dreyfus et les écrivains fr. *Paris*: Attinger, 1932. viii + 361 pp.

Eberwein, E.—Zur Deutung mittelalterlicher Existenz. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. 80 pp.

Eggli et Martino.—Le Débat romantique en Fr., 1813-30. T. I, 1813-16, par E. Eggli. *Paris*: Les Belles Lettres, 1933. 497 pp.

Gastinel, P.—Le Romantisme d'A. de Musset. *Paris*: Hachette, 1933. 705 pp.

Hier, F.—La Musique dans l'œuvre de M. Proust. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933.

Hoppe, H.—Impressionismus und Expressionismus bei E. Zola. *Münster*: Selbstverlag des Romanischen Seminars, 1933. vi + 53 pp.

Jenkins, T. A.—Word-Studies in Fr. and Eng. *Baltimore*: Waverly Press, 1933. 94 pp. (Language Monographs, no. 14, Sup. to Language.)

Lerch, E.—Franz: Sprache und Wesensart. *Frankfurt*: Diesterweg, 1933. 304 pp.

Loti, P.—Pêcheur d'Islande, ed. R. L. Marwede. *New York*: Doubleday, Doran, 1933. xxii + 215 pp. \$0.80.

Madaule, J.—Le Génie de P. Claudel. *Paris*: Desclée, De Brower, 1933. 458 pp.

Malot, Hector.—Perrine, d'après En Famille. Adapted and ed. Louise C. Seibert. *Chicago*: U. of Chicago Press, 1934. 222 pp.

Morrisette, B. A.—Les Aspects fondamentaux de l'esthétique symboliste. Univ. de Clermont diss., 1933. vi + 181 pp.

Nanteuil, J.—F. Brunetière. *Paris*: Bloud et Gay, 1934. 160 pp. Fr. 12.

Parker, C. S.—Fr. Stories of the Past and Present. *New York*: Holt, 1933. 322 + cxxviii pp. \$1.00.

Roosbroeck, G. L. van.—Unpub. Poems by Voltaire, Rousseau, etc. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933. 143 pp.



Rohrer, B.—Das Erdbeben von Lissabon in der franz.: Lit. des achtzehnten Jh. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 70 pp.

Sand, George.—L'Homme de neige, ed. F. E. Guyer. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933. x + 181 pp. \$1.15.

Sénéchal, Christian.—Les Grands Courants de la litt. fr. contemp. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1934. 464 pp. M. 6.

Stewart, H. L.—The Montaigne Quater-Centenary. Reprinted, U. of Toronto Quarterly, III, no. 2, 1934.

Talvart et Place. — Bibliographie des auteurs modernes de langue fr. 1801-1927. T. 4. *Paris*: Horizons de Fr., 1933. 409 pp.

Trahard, P.—Les Maîtres de la sensibilité fr. au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. T. VI. *Paris*: Boivin, 1934. Fr. 30.

Valesnes, R.—Molière et les femmes. *Paris*: Nilsson, 1933. 125 pp. Fr. 3.

Vildrac, Charles.—La Brouille, ed. G. B. Fundenburg. *Boston*: Heath, 1933. xiv + 139 pp.

Vincent, Fr.—Les Parnassiens. *Paris*: Beauchesne, 1934. 320 pp. Fr. 15.

Wendel, H.—Arkadien im Umkreis bukolischer Dichtung in der Antike und in der franz.: Lit. *Giessen*: 1933. 123 pp. (Giessener Beiträge, 26.)

Wilhelm, J.—Das Fortleben des Gallikanismus in der franz.: Lit. der Gegenwart. *Munich*: Hueber, 1933. viii + 219 pp.

### ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Rime, secondo le edizioni originali e gli autografi. Con uno studio introduttivo di F. Maggini. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. lxiv + 388 pp. L. 20. (Opere di Vittorio Alfieri, n. 5.)

Ariosto, Ludovico.—Orlando Furioso. Con introduzione e note di G. Raniolo. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. xx + 437 pp. L. 15.

Aurelio, A.—Uomini, leggende e canti di Dalmazia. *Roma*: "Gioielli italici," 1933. 61 pp. L. 3. (Coltura folcloristica.)

Bardi, G., e Bonifacio, G.—La vita, l'opera e i tempi di F. C. Pellegrini. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1933. x + 495 pp. L. 40.

Bertoni, G.—Cinque "letture dantesche." *Modena*: Soc. tip. Modenese, 1933. 145 pp. L. 8.

Bonelli, F.—Conversazioni grammaticali. Parte prima. *Ascoli Piceno*: "Picena domus," 1933. 103 pp. L. 4.

Buonoconto, A.—Gabriele D'Annunzio visto da Pescara oggi. *Napoli*: Edit. Tirrena 1933. 61 pp. L. 4.

Campanini, N.—L'Ariosto innamorato. *Reggio Emilia*: Officine graf. fasciste, 1933. 39 pp.

Catarelli, L.—Maria Vergine madre di Dio nelle opere di Dante. *Venezia*: C. Ferrari, 1933. 79 pp. L. 5.

Coli, L. P., e Rossi, G.—"Dolcissimo idioma." Grammatica della lingua italiana per le scuole medie. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1933. vii + 311 pp. L. 10.

D'Ardes, P.—Cesare De Titta poeta e umanista. *Napoli*: Arti graf. Arenella, 1933. 63 pp. L. 5.

Davoli, A.—La raccolta ariostea della Biblioteca municipale di Reggio Emilia. *Reggio Emilia*: Scuola di bibliografia italiana, 1933. 79 pp. L. 24. (Scritti della Scuola di bibliografia italiana, no. 23.)

De Carlo, F.—Studi letterari. *Salerno*: R. Beraglia, 1933. 236 pp. L. 12.

Emanuelli, E.—Uomo del '700: Ippolito Pindemonte. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1933. 124 pp. L. 10. (Collezione degli scrittori nuovi, no. 9.)

Fauci, F.—La lettera, il gergo mistico e i fondamenti allegorici della Vita Nuova. *Palermo*: F.lli Vena e C., 1933. 126 pp. L. 15.

Fiorentino, F.—Studi e ritratti della rinascenza. Estratti dalle opere del Fiorentino sul rinascimento, a cura di L. A. Omodeo. *Ascoli Piceno*: G. Cesari, 1933. 185 pp. L. 8. (I classici della filosofia.)

Foscolo, Ugo.—Poesie e prose scelte. Introduzione e note di M. Sterpa. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1933. 150 pp. L. 5. (Scrittori italiani.)

Fossi, P.—La conversione di Alessandro Manzoni. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. 16 pp. L. 22. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 232.)

Giannantonio, M.—La vita di Gabriele D'Annunzio. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1933. xv + 613 pp. L. 35. (Le scie.)

Giavesu, A.—Giosuè Carducci. Saggio di letteratura comparata. *Roma*: P. Maglione, 1933. 234 pp. L. 10.

Grassi-Privitera, G. B.—Somiglianze della lingua catalano-castigliana col dialetto siciliano. *Palermo*: "Boccone del povero," 1932. 66 pp. (Repr. fr. "Studi glottologici italiani," 1932.)

Leanti, G.—Nicolò Machiavelli e Francesco Guicciardini durante la crisi della libertà italiana. *Palermo*: Scuola tip. "Boccone del povero," 1933. 84 pp.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Epistolario, scelto e annotato ad uso delle scuole da G. De Robertis, con una introduzione sulla vita del poeta. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. xv + 163 pp. L. 8.50.

Mignosi, P.—Linee di una storia della nuova poesia italiana. *Palermo*: "La tradizione," 1933. 201 pp. L. 15.

Monelli, P.—Barbaro dominio. Cinquecento esotismi esaminati, combattuti e banditi dalla lingua con antichi e nuovi argomenti, storia ed etimologia delle parole e aneddoti per svagare il lettore. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1933. ix + 358 pp. L. 12.

Parpagliolo, L.—Italia negli scrittori italiani e stranieri, a cura di —. Vol. III: Campania. Vol. IV: Toscana. *Roma*: L. Morpurgo, 1932. 2 vols., xvi + 441, xvi + 433 pp. L. 55 each volume.

Pazzi, Gianna.—Il "belvedere" ferrarese nei versi di Ariosto e di Balbo. *Roma*: Ediz. Cosmopoli, 1933. 43 pp. L. 4.

Russo, L.—Elogio della polemica. Testimonianze di vita e di cultura, 1918-1932. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. xxiv + 330 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 234.)

Sorrentino, A.—Francesco Berni poeta della scapigliatura del rinascimento. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. iv + 259 pp. L. 18.

Tommaseo, R.—L'ora di Niccolò Tommaseo. Prefazione di A. Dudan. *Firenze*: G. Barbera, 1933. xxiii + 151 pp. L. 8.

Viezzioli, E.—Cardi alle soste. Poligrafia. *Trieste*: Off. graf. della edit. Libreria, 1933. 206 pp. L. 15.

# SPANISH

Ballestros y Beretta, A.—Historia de España. Tomo VII. *Barcelona*: Salvat, 1933. 804 pp. + 36 láms. 57 ptas.

Buceta, E.—Algunas relaciones de la "Menina e Moça" con la literatura española, especialmente con las novelas de Diego de San Pedro. *Madrid*: Artes Gráficas Municipales, 1933. 19 pp.

Calderón.—La vida es sueño. Ed. especial de 173 ejemplares numerados. *Barcelona*: G. Gili, 1933. 200 pp. + 35 grab. 250 ptas.

Camargo y Marín, C.—Un tríptico sobre Don Juan. Tres estudios de investigación sobre el tema de don Juan y un apéndice. *Madrid*: Edit. J. Morata, 1933. 231 pp. 5 ptas.

Cervantes.—Novelas ejemplares. Tomos I y II. Ed. en corcho. Texto corregido conforme a la ed. príncipe por Juan Suñé Benages. *Barcelona*: Edit. Orbis, [1933]. 18 hojas + 160 pp. y 7 hojas + 199 pp. 100 ptas. each vol.

Gárate, J.—G. de Humboldt. Estudio de sus trabajos sobre Vasconia. *Bilbao*: Imp. Provincial, 1933. xv + 222 pp.

González de Amezúa, A.—En el tercer centenario de "La Dorotea," de Lope de Vega (1632-1932). *Madrid*: Tip. de Archivos, 1933. 21 pp.

Jaramillo, M. A.—Índice Bibliográfico de la Biblioteca "Jaramillo" de Escritos Na-

cionales. Tomo I. *Cuenca, Ecuador*: Imp. de la Universidad, 1932. 356 pp.

Key-Ayala, S.—Series Hemero-Bibliográficas. la Serie. Bolivariana. *Caracas*: Tip. Americana, 1933. xiv + 202 pp.

Lemus y Rubio, P.—Aportaciones para la formación del Vocabulario Panocho o del dialecto de la Huerta de Murcia. *Murcia*: Imp. Provincial, 1933. 343 pp.

León, Fray L. de.—Obras poéticas. Texto y notas del P. José Llobera. Tomo II. Trads. del latín, griego y toscano e imitaciones. *Cuenca*: Biblioteca Diocesana Conquense, 1933. xxvi + 564 pp. 10 ptas.

Machado, A.—Poesías completas. 3a ed. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 432 pp. 6 ptas.

Manuscritos sobre Méjico en la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. *Madrid*: Gráficas Marinas, 1933. 277 pp.

Martínez de la Rosa, F.—Obras dramáticas. Ed. y notas de Jean Sarraill. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 416 pp. 10 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, 107.)

Menéndez y Pelayo, M.—Historia de España. Seleccionada de la obra del maestro. Pról. de J. Vigón. *Madrid*: Ediciones Fax, 1933. 358 pp. 8 ptas.

Palma, A.—Ricardo Palma. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Tor, 1933. 156 pp. (Las grandes biografías contemporáneas, VIII.)

Palos Yranzo, I.—El crucifijo en la historia, en la literatura y en el arte católicos. *Zaragoza*: Edit. "El Eco de la Cruz," 1933. 152 pp. 2 ptas.

Pastells, P.—Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la provincia del Paraguay, según los documentos originales del Archivo general de Indias. Tomo V. *Madrid*: V. Suárez, 1933. 376 pp.

Poetas de los siglos XVI y XVII.—Selección de G. Blanco Suárez. *Madrid*: Edit. Instituto Escuela, 1933. 355 pp. 5 ptas. (Biblioteca Literaria del Estudiante, XIX.)

Rogero Sánchez, J.—La historia literaria en los textos. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1933. 718 pp. 18 ptas.

Redondo, T. H.—Literatura española comparada con la extranjera. 6a ed. *Granada*: Artes Gráficas Granadinas, 1932. 450 pp. 14 pp.

Spanische Romanzen.—Herausgegeben von Ludwig Pfandl. *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1933. viii + 108 pp.

Vega, Lope de.—Los melindres de Belisa. Ed. critique publiée avec une Introduction et des Notes, por Henriette C. Barrau. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1933. 278 pp.

—[Obras]. Selección. estudio y notas de Américo Castro. *Madrid*: Edit. Instituto Escuela, 1933. 343 pp. (Biblioteca Literaria del Estudiante, XIV.)

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIX

MAY, 1934

Number 5

---

## THE DATE OF KEATS'S *FALL OF HYPERION*

Miss Lowell's theory that *The Fall of Hyperion* was Keats's first version was made out of whole cloth, and was, for most people, thoroughly demolished by Mr. De Selincourt and Mr. Middleton Murry. Since that time, however, the theory has received support from a Keats scholar, Professor Claude Finney, and it is on his more lucid exposition that I wish to comment.<sup>1</sup> Taking Wordsworth and Milton as representing the two poles in Keats's view of poetry, Mr. Finney traces through Keats's letters his varying reactions to these two poets. The bulk of the article is a valuable and illuminating study of Keats's intellectual and spiritual background, but when Mr. Finney uses his conclusions to support Miss Lowell, he seems to me to build a case on very shaky foundations. This is Mr. Finney's summary of his opinions, in part:

The letters which he wrote during the next four months [after April, 1818] are filled with his enthusiasm for Wordsworth's humanitarianism. In this period he made an intuition of "Hyperion" as a vision in which he would express the ideals of humanitarianism. After he returned from his Scotch excursion, 18 August, he composed an introduction for this projected humanitarian version of "Hyperion," but abandoned the undertaking before he began to compose the body of the poem. This humanitarian introduction is preserved as the introduction to *The Fall of Hyperion*, the body of which, however, is a revised portion of a later and Miltonic version. . . . In *Hyperion*, which he composed in imitation of the style of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Keats expressed the neo-Platonic philosophy of beauty. Dissatisfied with the style of Milton, he made a futile attempt in August and September, 1819, to fuse the Wordsworthian and Miltonic versions into a third version, *The Fall of Hyperion*; but he failed, because he no longer believed in humanitarianism, and because he could not remove the style of Milton without destroying the beauty of the verse.

In this reconstruction Mr. Finney does not distinguish between known fact and pure conjecture, and the proportion of known fact

<sup>1</sup> "The Fall of Hyperion," *JEGP.*, xxvi (1927), 304 ff.

is very small. In the absence of external evidence on his side, Mr. Finney relies on the internal evidence of the letters to indicate the ebb and flow of Keats's enthusiasm for Wordsworth, and hence, by a rather daring leap, to think that the introduction to the *Fall* must have been written at a time when the letters show that the tide was at the full, the particular season chosen being August and September, 1818.

However rich the letters are, they do not contain all of Keats's ideas about his reading or his own work. (How much of Mr. Finney's suggestive interpretation of *Endymion*, for instance, receives definite confirmation from the letters?) The letters of the four months following April, 1818, Mr. Finney says, are filled with Keats's enthusiasm for Wordsworth's humanitarianism. Let us see what the letters of this period contain in the way of references to Wordsworth. Early in April Keats says Wordsworth has gone rather huffed out of town: "he cannot expect his fireside Divan to be infallible—he cannot expect but that every man of worth is as proud as himself . . ." (I, 140).<sup>2</sup> A few weeks later he thinks he begins to understand "the Burden of the Mystery" (I, 152). In the same letter he compares Wordsworth and Milton at some length in regard to their knowledge of the human heart and their anxiety for humanity, and ascribes the apparent superiority of Wordsworth less to individual power than to the general advance of mankind (see below). In June Keats laments the defection of a lost leader, "Lord Wordsworth," who has been canvassing for the Lowthers (I, 168). He calls on Wordsworth but does not find him at home (I, 169, 171, 175). He quotes twice from an insignificant poem of Wordsworth's (I, 172, 177). In July he writes some doggerel verses in which he takes a fling at Wordsworth's political activities (I, 203). In such a list of allusions I fail to discern signs of a marked and definite conversion to Wordsworthian humanitarianism. As for evidence of Keats's humanitarian sentiments apart from any Wordsworthian reference, that occurs anywhere in the letters of any period; Keats's resolutions to study, to get knowledge, for example, are no more Wordsworthian than Miltonic (see the quotation below, from the poem on Milton). These allusions to Wordsworth, then, show

<sup>2</sup> References are to the Maurice Buxton Forman edition of Keats's *Letters* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931).

the same mixture of attraction and repulsion that one finds in Keats at all times, but they seem to Mr. Finney to prove a special enthusiasm; "he accepted Wordsworth's humanitarianism in April, 1818." Mr. Finney has rather a tendency to see Keats accepting and rejecting various "isms" as one tries on coats. If such remarks in the letters are sufficient to prove that Keats wrote the Wordsworthian introduction to the *Fall* in August and September, 1818, one could easily assemble quite as good evidence for several other periods.

For, as Mr. Finney's article makes clear, though he does not seem to be aware that the fact damages his method of argument, the letters everywhere record fluctuating moods, which are sometimes ripples on the surface, sometimes not. To mention one illustration of this, Keats's mature life and work reveals, at the very centre of it, a perpetual conflict between "sensation" and knowledge; it is really his major theme. But his attitudes can shift with surprising suddenness. Thus in a letter of January 23, 1818 (I, 92), he encloses his poem on Milton, in which he longs to "grow high-rife With Old Philosophy." A month later (I, 113), in his poem on the thrush, sent to Reynolds, he says:

O fret not after knowledge—I have none,  
And yet my song comes native with the warmth.

Two days later (I, 115) he writes to his brothers: "I am reading Voltaire and Gibbon, although I wrote to Reynolds the other day to prove reading of no use." How then can these letters be used with the precision of mathematical formulae to calculate a planet into existence?

Mr. Finney says (p. 319): "After October, 1818, Keats never revealed in his letters a serious interest in Wordsworth's humanitarianism." "Serious" of course may be variously interpreted, but a consecutive reading of the letters does not, I think, show such a clear-cut abandonment of Wordsworth—and we may remember that Keats had kicked out against Wordsworth a number of times before. In March, 1819 (II, 335), in a passage damning Hunt and others, Keats records only two literary admirations, Hazlitt and "half of Wordsworth." A few days later he writes at length about human disinterestedness, and says (II, 341):

But then, as Wordsworth says, "we have all one human heart"—there

is an electric fire in human nature tending to purify—so that among these human creature[s] there is continually some birth of new heroism.

As a friend of Reynolds and admirer of Wordsworth, Keats is embarrassed in reviewing the skit on *Peter Bell* (April, 1819), but he goes out of his way to remark that the parodist "has felt the finer parts of Mr. Wordsworth, and perhaps expatiated with his more remote and sublimer muse. . . . The more he may love the sad embroidery of the *Excursion*; the more he will hate the coarse Samplers of Betty Foy and Alice Fell . . ." (II, 355). In May (II, 373) Keats quotes

Nothing can bring back the hour  
Of splendour in the grass and glory in the flower,

and says: "I once thought this a Melancholist's dream"; in other words, the lines now express his own maturest and deepest feelings. Such references do not suggest that Keats's Wordsworthianism was dead.

In relating the *Fall* to Wordsworth and *Hyperion* to Milton, Mr. Finney appears to make a too decisive dichotomy. The *Fall* of course is quite Miltonic, and, though this is perhaps less obvious, the core of *Hyperion*, which is in the speeches of Coelus and Oceanus, is extremely Wordsworthian. The essence of the speech of Oceanus is summed up in an important passage of the letters (I, 157), which Mr. Finney cites. Milton, Keats says, did not think into the human heart as Wordsworth has done, yet Milton as a philosopher "had sure as great powers as Wordsworth."

What is then to be infer'd? O many things. It proves there is really a grand march of intellect, It proves that a mighty providence subdues the mightiest Minds to the service of the time being, whether it be in human Knowledge or Religion.

If I possessed Mr. Notcutt's imagination, I would suggest on the basis of this passage that the Titans represent Milton and Apollo Wordsworth. As it is, I will merely quote a bit of the *Excursion* (v. 465 ff.):

Is Man  
A child of hope? Do generations press  
On generations, without progress made?

"So," says Oceanus, "on our heels a fresh perfection treads."

Besides, Milton is for Keats a humanitarian as well as other

things. "He was moreover an active friend to Man all his Life and has been since his death" (I, 132). In October, 1818, Keats writes: "We have no Milton, no Algernon Sidney" (I, 254; and see 255). In August, 1819, we have such mixtures of ideas as appear in these familiar extracts. "Shakspeare," he says, "and the paradise Lost every day become greater wonders to me. I look upon fine Phrases like a Lover" (II, 400). Here he seems to be thinking of Milton as an artist, a stylist. But then: "I am convinced more and more day by day that fine writing is, next to fine doing the top thing in the world; the Paradise Lost becomes a greater wonder" (II, 406). "Next to fine doing!" The letters, as I said, are full of more or less contradictory and spontaneous utterances that testify to the inward conflict. By an arbitrary use of such utterances, and disregard of known dates, one could rearrange the whole Keats canon.

That the introduction to the *Fall* is somewhat Dantesque, and that Keats had taken Cary with him to Scotland in the summer of 1818, does not mean much. If, following Mr. Finney's method, we use the letters as our guide, we find no evidence that Keats read much Dante in Scotland; he says that he has no books except Cary, but that is almost all. On September 21, a month after his return, he quotes a phrase from the *Inferno* (I, 235). But, whether he read Dante much at this time or not it does not follow that Dante would have soaked in very far, or that such influence would have shown itself immediately. Further, we have evidence of his interest in Dante during the very time—November, 1819—when Keats was engaged, according to Brown, in remodelling *Hyperion*. In *The Indicator* for December 8, 1819, Hunt reported a conversation of "the other day" with "a friend" (whom he later identified as Keats), about the treatment of Ulysses in the *Inferno*.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Finney finds inconsistencies in *Hyperion* which, he thinks, result from opposed conceptions of the Titans. Keats's sympathy at first was with the Olympians; then, says Mr. Finney, when he accepted Wordsworth's humanitarianism in April, 1818, he made the Titans, the humanitarian gods, the heroes; and in such a passage as *Hyperion*, i. 106 ff., Mr. Finney sees in Saturn's reference to the loss of "all godlike exercise Of influence benign," a sur-

<sup>3</sup> Walter E. Peck, "Keats on Poet-Historians," *Books, New York Herald Tribune*, October 16, 1927.

vival of the humanitarian conception. The lines on the mild and beneficent reign of the Titans are numerous and central (see i. 316-19, 329-31, ii. 208 ff., 335 ff.), and seem to be quite consistent with Keats's conception of his theme and of progress. Keats apparently did not think of the Titans as primitive deities of brute force and tyranny; Oceanus speaks of them as one link, not the first, in the upward succession. The rude and primitive did not appeal to Keats's temperament and he would, having Lear in his mind, present Saturn as a noble ruler, superior to what had gone before. But, and this is the point of the speech of Coelus (i. 309 ff., and cf. ii. 93), these benign, beneficent Titans had, in a crisis, behaved not like gods but like frail mortals; they had been guilty of "fear, hope, and wrath; Actions of rage and passion." They had reverted to type, and now, in defeat, some of them appealed to force. Their weakness, says Coelus, is the sign of ruin; it is, says Keats, a reason for their being superseded. Hence the larger vision and wisdom of Oceanus:

O folly! for to bear all naked truths,  
And to envisage circumstance, all calm,  
That is the top of sovereignty.

And that is the constant burden of the *Excursion*, though Wordsworth's exposition has a frequent Christian coloring that does not appear in Keats. But throughout the *Excursion* Wordsworth expounds the discipline that ensures stability, and strives to achieve the peace that subsists at the heart of endless agitation.

Finally, in the introduction to the *Fall*—which also echoes the *Excursion*—Keats cries out against the tribe of poet dreamers to which he thinks he belongs. If he wrote this introduction in the early autumn of 1818, what writings of his own was he so bitterly condemning? Not, certainly, the juvenilia, sonnets, and many unimportant occasional pieces. Not *Endymion*, for the central parable of the third and fourth books is Keats's version of Wordsworthian humanitarianism. Not *Sleep and Poetry*, which sets forth the doctrine of *Tintern Abbey*. Was it *Isabella* (the humanitarian stanzas of which led Mr. Shaw to see in Keats a promising Marxist) that alone occasioned Keats's agonized self-flagellation? In short, there does not appear to be any reason for disputing the only dates supported by valid evidence.

DOUGLAS BUSH

*University of Minnesota*



## THE HIGHLAND FEASTS OF FERGUS MACIVOR AND LORD LOVAT

In drawing the character of Fergus MacIvor, a powerful chief who maintains feudal sway over his clan in order to further his personal schemes of ambition through the restoration of the Stuarts, Scott could summon to his aid from the pages of history the actual intrigues and bold venturing of many a Highland leader in the Rebellions of 1715 and 1745. Among these chiefs, Simon Fraser Lord Lovat would seem on first scrutiny to offer little else than contrast to Fergus, who, though equal to him in self-interest and guile, was far from imitating his vacillation between Hanoverians and Jacobites according to the dictates of policy. Indeed, had Fergus been as shifty as Lord Lovat, he would have involved the plot of *Waverley* in awkward complications and, in addition, would have had by his side no self-devoted sister, sharing his projects, but not his motives.

Despite the very obvious distinction between the two men, however, their lives afford a more striking parallel than could result from coincidence alone. Scott describes Fergus as "bold, ambitious, and ardent, yet artful and politic," with "a character of uncommon acuteness, fire, and ambition," and Lovat, in his review of the *Culloden Papers*, as illustrating by his history "the effect of power and ambition upon a mind naturally shrewd, crafty, and resolute, but wild, tameless, and unprincipled,"<sup>1</sup> and as possessing "a character at once bold, cautious, and crafty; loving command, yet full of flattery and dissimulation."<sup>2</sup> Each chief, when placed in command of an independent company of the Black Watch, organised to preserve peace in the Highlands, exerted his military authority to prepare the Gael for a future rising.

He [Lovat] made it a main argument . . . that it was their duty to enter into his company by rotation; and . . . he thus procured the means, without suspicion, of training to military discipline his whole clan by turns.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Quarterly Review*, xiv (1815-16), p. 316.      <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, xiv, 325.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, xiv, 324. In the note on "Highland Policy," added nearly fifteen years after the original publication of *Waverley*, Sir Walter calls attention to the historicity of Fergus MacIvor's tactics: "This sort of political game ascribed to MacIvor was in reality played by several Highland chiefs, the celebrated Lord Lovat in particular, who used that kind of finesse to the uttermost."

He [Fergus] caused his vassals to enter by rotation into his company, and serve for a certain space of time, which gave them all in turn a general notion of military discipline.

Both men were deprived of their commands by a government which seemed to suspect the duplicity practiced.<sup>4</sup> In recognition of services rendered and as an inducement to future exertions, James III granted Fergus an earl's patent; to Lovat he gave, on 14th March 1740, the titles of "Duke of Fraser, Marquis of Beaufort, Earl of Strath-Therrick [*i. e.* Strath-errick] and Upper Tarf [*i. e.* Abertarf], Viscount of the Aird and Strath-Glass, Lord Lovat and Beaulieu [*i. e.* Beauilly]." <sup>5</sup> Both of these Jacobite noblemen were beheaded for complicity in the '45.

Although Scott apparently had Lovat in mind while working on certain features of Fergus MacIvor's portrait, he definitely borrows only one episode from the Lovat saga—that of the Highland feast. It will be remembered that Edward Waverley enters a hall which occupies the first floor of MacIvor's original structure, through whose entire length extends a huge oaken table. The following order of precedence among the numerous company is carefully observed: the chief, with Edward and two or three Highland visitors of neighbouring clans; the elders of his own tribe, "wadsetters" and "tacksmen"; their sons and nephews and foster-brethren; the officers of the chief's household, according to their rank; and, lowest of all, the tenants who actually cultivate the soil. Even beyond this long perspective, Edward sees upon the green, to which a huge pair of folding doors opens, a multitude of inferior Highlanders; in the distance are women, ragged boys and girls, beggars, young and old, and dogs of every description. The viands, too, have their gradations in quality: fish and game; immense clumsy joints of mutton and beef; a yearling lamb, called "a hog in har'st," roasted whole and attacked by the clansmen with knives and dirks; and, lower down still, even coarser, though sufficiently abundant, fare. Broth, onions, cheese, and the fragments of the feast regale those in the open air. As for the drinks, excellent claret and champagne circulate among the chief's immediate

<sup>4</sup> See W. C. Mackenzie, *Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat His Life and Times* (London, 1908), p. 309, n. 3, and *Waverley*, Chapter XIX.

<sup>5</sup> The Marquis of Ruigny and Raineval, *The Jacobite Peerage* (Edinburgh, 1904), p. 56.

neighbours, while strong beer and whisky, plain or diluted, refresh the men who sit farther from the head of the table. As each man understood that his taste was to be formed according to his rank at table, no one took offence at this inequality of distribution; the tacksmen, for example, always declared the wine too cold for their stomachs and called, apparently out of choice, for the liquor assigned them for reasons of economy.<sup>6</sup>

In my abridgment I have retained Scott's phrasing wherever brevity permitted. The following is an account of a similar feast presided over by Lord Lovat and chronicled by the author of *Memoirs of the Life and Gallant Exploits of the Old Highlander, Serjeant Donald Macleod* (London, 1791), a copy of which may be found in the library at Abbotsford:<sup>7</sup>

He lived in all the fulness and dignity of the ancient hospitality, being more solicitous, according to the genius of feudal times, to retain and multiply adherents than to accumulate wealth by the improvement of his estate. As scarcely any fortune, and certainly not his fortune, was adequate to the extent of his views, he was obliged to regulate his unbounded hospitality by rules of prudent oeconomy. As his spacious hall was crowded by kindred visitors, neighbours, vassals, and tenants of all ranks, the table, that extended from one end of it nearly to the other, was covered, at different places, with different kinds of meat and drink; though of each kind there was always great abundance. At the head of the table, the lords and lairds pledged his lordship in claret, and sometimes champagne; the tacksmen, or duniwassals, drank port or whiskey punch; tenants, or common husbandmen, refreshed themselves with strong beer: and below the utmost extent of the table, at the door, and sometimes without the door of the hall, you might see a multitude of Frazers, without shoes or bonnets, regaling themselves with bread and onions, with a little cheese perhaps, and small beer. Yet, amidst the whole of this aristocratical inequality, Lord Lovat had the address to keep all his guests in perfectly good humour. Cousin, he would say to such and such a tacksman, or duniwassal, I told my pantry lads to hand you some claret, but they tell me ye like port and punch best. In like manner, to the beer-drinkers, he would say, Gentlemen, there is what ye please at your service: but I send you ale, because I understand ye like ale best. Every body was thus well

---

<sup>6</sup> *Waverley*, Chapter XX. See also the note on "A Scottish Dinner-Table," in which Scott is apparently reminded of the household at Castle Downie by his own description of the imaginary meal at the Castle of Glennaquoich.

<sup>7</sup> See *Catalogue of the Library at Abbotsford* (Edinburgh, 1838), p. 80. The library also contains much biographical material on Lord Lovat—*Catalogue*, pp. 89, 90, 94, 96, and 100.

pleased; and none were so ill-bred as to gainsay what had been reported to his lordship.<sup>8</sup>

The banquet in *Waverley*, unlike that just described, is considerably enlivened by music: "The bagpipers, three in number, screamed, during the whole time of dinner, a tremendous war-tune." Lord Lovat's *ménage* was not without this characteristic bit of Highland splendour, although an English visitor, Captain Edward Burt, did think the "concealed Musicians" were imported from Inverness to impress him: "We were no sooner sat down to Table, but a Band of Musick struck up in a little Place out of Sight, and continued Playing all the Time of Dinner."<sup>9</sup>

Scott's treatment of the Highland dinner as he found it described in the *Memoirs* and in Burt's Letters is highly characteristic of his narrative art. He takes a picturesque scene in which the figures are almost consciously awaiting the breath of life and animates it by dialogue, action, and conflict or contrast of personalities. As a result of his great knowledge of the '15 and the '45, gained from books and oral tradition, the *Waverley* novels dealing with the Jacobite risings are in many ways historico-romantic mosaics which gain unity, force, and continuity from the interpretive activity of the author's imagination. And in the mosaic of *Waverley* one of the finest bits is the Highland feast of Fergus MacIvor.

COLEMAN O. PARSONS

*Vassar College*

---

#### DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI'S COMMENTS ON *MAUD*

Among the unpublished portions of the letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to William Allingham, now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, there are extensive remarks by Rossetti upon *Maud* and upon Tennyson's reaction to the reception of that poem by the critics. These passages were left unpublished by George Birkbeck

<sup>8</sup> *Memoirs*, pp. 47-8. Cf. "Letters written by Mrs. Grant of Laggan concerning Highland Affairs and Persons connected with the Stuart Cause in the Eighteenth Century," ed. J. R. N. Macphail, *Publications of the Scottish History Society*, xxvi (1896), 260-61.

<sup>9</sup> Captain Burt, *Letters from a Gentleman in the North of Scotland* (London, 1754), I, 183. Scott also had a Highland piper—J. G. Lockhart, *Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk* (1819), Letter II.

Hill, the editor of Rossetti's letters to Allingham, in 1897, for reasons that will be apparent. They are published now, when there can be no personal feeling as a result, with the permission of Mrs. Nell Allingham and Miss Belle da Costa Greene, Director of the Pierpont Morgan Library.

In his letter of July 29, 1855, Rossetti wrote to Allingham: "I've just hastily read through *Maud*; very great of course, but seems an odd De Balzacish sort of story for an Englishman at Tennyson's age." In the twenty-seventh letter, dated August, 1855, after a more thorough study of *Maud*, Rossetti wrote to Allingham again, criticizing the poem at length. Hill left the following passage unpublished:

What do you think of *Maud*? I don't know whether Woolner's precursory trumpet has done it harm with me, but I am (as yet) disappointed in it. Of course much is most lovely—especially the garden scene—but much is surely artificial, and that incomprehensible section of the two governors getting groggy together. The leading character is quite uncongenial and a person who, being made the medium of the social and other views, deprives them of all value in fact, though to be sure you know they're Tennyson's, or rather that T. has written so about them, for they are much more like a sort of thing the author thinks "ought" to be written, but about which he feels lazy and thinks it (as some of his readers perhaps do) nothing but a bore. In style too these parts are quite generally overloaded and sometimes almost as bad as *Lady Geraldine's Courtship*<sup>1</sup> without so much "go" in them either. The story throughout, from the "flattened" father onward, seems worthy rather of Alex. Smith than Tennyson. Of course, after all this abuse, one mustn't miss saying how glorious some of the poetry is and how admirable in its way *The Brook* is throughout. The other poems seem not quite up to T.'s mark, except the little bit called *Will*; which in its closing lines is most like him of any, I think. I dare say that you know that *Maud* originated in the section, "Would that 'twere possible," etc., which was printed in an annual many years ago and was liked so much (as one hears) by T.'s friends that he kept it in view and gradually worked it up into the story. The best parts of the old section are as good I think as anything in the poem, but one can trace the incongruity of the "make up" in the passages referring to the "leagues of lights", "roaring of wheels", etc.; which would refer neither to the country place where Maud lived nor to Brittany where the passage is supposed to be written, but evidently were meant in the first instance for London; which, by the bye, is roaring under my window just now at breakfast time and making me seem the only person not at work.

In his next letter, dated November 25, 1855, Rossetti was still

<sup>1</sup> This is the ballad with that title by Elizabeth Barrett Browning.

upon the subject of *Maud*, but with an interest now in the personal reaction of Tennyson to his critics. Concerning this letter William Michael Rossetti wrote:

When Dr. Birkbeck Hill was editing the *Letters of Dante Rossetti to William Allingham*, he had in his hands one letter in which Rossetti spoke of a recent interview of his with Tennyson. He did not here say anything detrimental to Tennyson, whom in truth he greatly admired as a poet, and liked (so far as he saw him) as a man; but he related one or two incidents symptomatic of the more off-hand or unconventional shades of the poet's demeanor. Dr. Hill and Mrs. Allingham<sup>2</sup> agreed in thinking that, before this letter was published, it should be shown to the present Lord Tennyson, for consideration by himself and his mother. The reply came in terms more than sufficiently strong to the effect that the publication of such details might be the death of Lady Tennyson. Therefore all that part of the letter was excluded from the volume.<sup>3</sup>

The omission is indicated on page 162 of Hill's volume, in the midst of Rossetti's account of that so-called "night of the Gods" when Tennyson read *Maud* and Browning read "Fra Lippo Lippi" to a small group of friends. The following words indicate that the atmosphere of the Gods was not untainted with mortal weaknesses:

I was never more amused in my life than by Tennyson's groanings and horrors over the reviews of *Maud*, which poem he read through to us, spouting also several sections to be introduced in a new edition. I made a sketch of him reading, which I gave to Browning, and afterwards a duplicate of it for Miss Siddall. His conversation was really one perpetual groan, and I am sure during the two long evenings I spent in his company he repeated the same stories about anonymous letters he gets, etc., at the very least 6 or 8 times in my hearing, besides an odd time or two, as I afterwards found, that he told them to members of the company in private. He also repeated them to me again, walking home together. All this to the intense wonder of Browning, who, as you know, treats reviewers in the way they deserve. Tennyson actually insisted that for twelve years after his first publication, no notice whatever was taken of him, and seemed rather annoyed at anyone recollecting to the contrary. Of course there was something delightful in the genuineness of all this, and he is quite as glorious in his way as Browning, and perhaps, of the two men, more impressive on the whole personally. One of his stories was about an anonymous letter running thus (received since *Maud* came out): "Sir, I used to worship you. Now I hate you; I loathe and detest you, you beast! You've taken to imitating Longfellow.

Yours in aversion,"

---

<sup>2</sup> This was Mrs. Helen Allingham, now deceased.

<sup>3</sup> *Some Reminiscences* (New York, 1906), p. 259.

. . . "and no name," says Alfred, scoring the table with an indignant thumb and glaring round with suspended pipe while his auditors look as sympathetic as their view of the matter permits. He has an irreconcilable grudge against a poor mope of a fellow called Archer Gurney,<sup>4</sup> who he swears must be the author of the letter, having treated him before to titbits something in the same taste. But the idea of literary cabals under which he is destined to sink one day never seemed to leave his mind. As we walked home, we passed the Holborn Casino, before which cabs were drawn up. "What's that place?" asks A. T., and on my telling him,— "Ah!" he says, "I'd rather like to go there, but La!" (a minute afterwards) "there'd be some newspaper man, and he'd know me."

M. L. HOWE

*New Haven, Connecticut*

---

### PROBLEMS OF LYRIC FORM

The concepts of rational and irrational, closed and open form in literature, present a somewhat confusing problem since it is difficult to discriminate between the rational content of a literary production and the rational and irrational form of its expression, a difficulty complicated even more through the fact that elements of form may be simultaneously rational and irrational factors of expression. Thus anaphora may on the one hand, serve to emphasize order of syntax and disposition of content, on the other it may through the repetition of word or word groups directly convey the intensity of an expressed emotion. Form, again, may be structurally or metrically closed but melodically open or the opposite may be the case. Little work has so far been done in this field and even Strich, who was instrumental in opening the discussion through his *Klassik und Romantik*, does not always avoid confusion. Theodor A. Meyer in a very thoughtful article (which, by the way, gives full credit to the merits of Strich's book, *Dt. Vjs.* 1925, p. 231 ff.) takes issue with his assertion that Romantic art, as an art of infinity, of constant change and motion, contradicts all laws of form, presents its material as a singular tone in the melody of infinite time (p. 269, Strich, p. 107/8) and is not capable of closed form. Against this thesis, Meyer upholds that in all true art, form expresses the temporal to its fullest extent but simultaneously raises it into the light of eternal human laws; furthermore, that open form must

<sup>4</sup> Archer Thompson Gurney (1820-1887) was a poet and theologian.

not be mistaken for formlessness. No doubt, Strich on the one hand, rests his conclusions too much on Romantic theory, on the other he generalizes too much on the basis of works which are not sufficiently typical, as, for instance, in the comparison between Eichendorff's and Goethe's *Meeresstille* (p. 167 ff.).

To clarify these problems the following detailed study was undertaken, analyzing three poems of which the first two are related in subject while the last seems especially well suited for an illustration of melodic unity.

## 1.

## GRETCHEN (am Spinnrocken allein)

	Typus		Typus
I. 1. Meine Rùh ist hìn, Mein Hèrz ist schwér, Ich finde sie nimmer Und nimmer mèhr.	B C	3. Sein höher Gáng, Sein edle Gestált, Seines Múndes Lächeln, Seiner Áugen Gewált	B A
2. Wo ich ihn nicht hàb Ist mìr das Gráb, Die gånze Wèlt Ist mir vergállt.	D B	4. Und seiner Réde Záuberflúß, Sein Hándedrück Und àch sein Kúß!	C D
3. Mein àrmer Kópff Ist mìr verrúckt, Mein àrmer Sínn Ist mìr zerstückt.	B B	III. 1. Meine Rùh ist hìn, Mein Hèrz ist schwér, Ich finde sie nimmer Und nimmer mèhr.	B C
II. 1. Meine Rùh ist hìn, Mein Hèrz ist schwér Ich finde sie nimmer Und nimmer mèhr.	B C	2. Mein Schòß! Gott! drángt Sich nàch ihm hìn. Ach dúrft ich fàssen Und hálten ihn	B C
2. Nach íhm nur schàù ich Zum Fénster hinaùs, Nach íhm nur geh ich Àùs dem Hàùs.	A D	3. Und kússen ihn So wie ich wóllt, An seinen Kússen Vergéhen sóllt!	D C

*Margarete's Monologue at the Spinning Wheel* by Goethe, to be sure, does not exemplify the pure genus-form (Gattungsform) of the specifically lyric poem on account of its strong admixture of the dramatic element. It is, however, lyric in so far as it has for its theme the psychic state or mood of an unendurable erotic tension yearning for a complete abandon.

The presentation of this content is accomplished verbally in a



clear, simple realistic diction of a strongly anaphoric structure and parallel phraseology (*Meine Ruh ist . . . , mein Herz ist . . . ; ist mir verrückt, ist mir zerstückt etc.*). There are only two metaphoric expressions, *Welt ein Grab*, *Rede Zauberfluß*, unless we consider *Kopf verrückt*, *Sinn zerstückt* also as such. In opposition to this rational verbal rendering we have a non-logical syntax of sentences and phrases, unconnected in the first part, linked with *und* in the second to indicate emotional acceleration. The only subordinate constructions *Wo ich ihn nicht hab, sowie ich wollt* are not of a dialectic character and the dependent condition *wenn ich ihn fassen dürfte, so sollte ich* is changed to an independent exclamation.

The disposition of the poem is translucid and ordered. The refrain stanza (*Meine Ruh ist hin to nimmermehr*) divides it into three groups of three, four, and three stanzas and, sounding the dominant theme of departure, at the same time forms a point of rest and return in the progressive, dramatic ascension of the composition to the climactic ending.

The first group of stanzas (refrain plus 2 stanzas) shows by means of the pronouns *meine, meine, ich mir, mir, mein, mir* that Gretchen is the center of attention, while the single *ihn* in stanza 2 points to Faust as the aim of her yearning.

In the second group (refrain plus 3 stanzas) Faust is referred to with *ihm, ihm, sein, sein, seines, seiner, sein, sein*, as against a two-fold *ich* (Gretchen) at the outset (Group II, stanza 2).

In the third group (refrain plus 2 stanzas) the pronouns alternate: *mein-ihm; ich-ihn, ihn; ich-seinen*, indicating the desired union of the lovers.

But since this union is only imagined, subjective, expressed through the subjunctive *solt'*, the melody curve attains no complete and closing cadence but causes our own feeling involuntarily to turn back to the initial refrain *Meine Ruh ist hin*, thus completing the circle, a movement which is symbolized by the spinning wheel at which Gretchen is sitting. (A similar technique, by the way, Goethe has employed in his poem *Ganymed*, where the ending reverts to and illustrates the title.)

It may, however, not be inferred—as Kühnemann strangely assumes in his *Goethe*—that the poem is spoken to the treading of the wheel, a presentation which would entirely destroy its symbol

value and, moreover, induce an impossible rationalizing of the recitation. On the contrary, the wheel is at rest, but in Margareta's head the thoughts revolve, halting, hesitating in simple modesty, but relentlessly and inexorably.

Metrically the poem presents at first glance the rationally ordered unity-form of fourstressed iambic couplets. But in contrast to the unity-form (*Einheitsform*), stands the expression-form (*Ausdrucksform*) of the poem, if we adopt this term of Theodor A. Meyer for the factors of language, rhythm, and melody which, without taking the devious way over rational speech and traditional meter, express directly, non-rationally, musically—so to say—the emotions involved. Expressive in this sense are the typographic breaking of the fourstressed line in two parts, indicating the aforementioned halting speech (interior rhyme occurs only line 1070/3), the additional unstressed syllables for the purpose of acceleration, and the bursting asunder of stanzaic bounds toward the end of group II and III by the onward pressing emotional urge. Moreover, the ordered monotony of equal accents is disturbed by their gradation into melodic types, which enter into a series of everchanging variations: the refrain stanza has types B and C, followed in group I by D B, B B; in group II by A D, B A, C D; in group III by B C, D C; a free and expressive melodic flux and reflux of powerful effect. Thus the poem as a whole presents a rationally ordered, dynamically progressing, plastic gesture whose expression-form threatens to disrupt from within the unity-form which binds it.

To the subjective passion of the girl, to the restless circling of her thoughts, on the one hand, corresponds the non-rational expression: alogic, asyndetic and polysyndetic in turn, breaking verse and stanza, with predominating melodic accent and a weakening of the end cadence, which reverts to the beginning. To the objectivity of presentation, to the raising of the theme into the supra-temporal, the typical, on the other hand, corresponds the art of ordered and controlled form with unity verse, syntactic parallelism, structure of stanzas, and closed form of the poem in climatic disposition. The counter action of these two elements constitute the powerful dynamic suggestiveness, the consummate poetic perfection which are the stamp of Goethe's characteristic and organic art even in this pre-classic period.

## 2.

BRENTANO: *DER SPINNERIN LIED*

- |                                   |                |  |                 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|--|-----------------|
| I, 1. Es sang vor langen Jahren   | a <sup>1</sup> | 2. Ich sing und kann nicht weinen                | ei <sup>1</sup> |
| Wohl auch die Nachtigall;         |                | Und spinne so allein                             |                 |
| Das war ein süßer Schall,         |                | Den Faden klar und rein,                         |                 |
| Da wir zusammen waren.            | a <sup>2</sup> | Solang der Mond wird scheinen.                   | ei <sup>2</sup> |
| II, 3. Da wir zusammen waren,     | a <sup>2</sup> | 4. Sooft der Mond mag scheinen,                  | ei <sup>2</sup> |
| Da sang die Nachtigall;           |                | Gedenk ich dein allein,                          |                 |
| Nun mahnet mich ihr Schall,       |                | Mein Herz ist klar und rein,                     |                 |
| Daß du von mir gefahren.          | a <sup>3</sup> | Gott wolle uns vereinen!                         | ei <sup>3</sup> |
| III, 5. Seit du von mir gefahren, | a <sup>3</sup> | 6. Gott wolle uns vereinen!                      | ei <sup>3</sup> |
| Singt stets die Nachtigall;       |                | Hier spinn ich so allein,                        |                 |
| Ich denk bei ihrem Schall,        |                | Der Mondscheintklar und rein, (ei <sup>2</sup> ) |                 |
| Wie wir zusammen waren.           | a <sup>2</sup> | . Ich sing und möchte weinen.                    | ei <sup>1</sup> |

Brentano's poem *Der Spinnerin Lied*, as the title indicates a *Rollengedicht*, clearly belongs to the genus-form lyric, since its theme is the yearning of forsaken love, not, as it might seem, an epic presentation of the theme of the abandoned maiden. The contrast to Goethe's poem is striking: no action, no motion, pure musically vibrating mood and on that account a minimum of rational wording; for nightingale, moon, spinning, singing, weeping, are not rational, not even picturing, let alone plastic factors; their cumulative, suggestive effect together with their sound quality constitute the non-rational mood values of the poem. The only active element seems to be time, which once saw the girl in her happiness, now sees her sad and forsaken, and which may reunite her with her lover in the future. It is indeed "melody of infinite time, the music of which connects far past with far future," as Strich characterizes one of Eichendorff's lyrics (p. 167).

If we consider the metrical form, we find six structurally equal stanzas of rational unity-form, iambic threestressed tetrameters with pause and alternating feminine and masculine endings. But of the non-rational elements of this form the musical quality so strongly predominates that in comparison Goethe's melodic types seem entirely dynamic; for in Brentano's lyric the vowel combinations are used like musical figures. The six stanzas divide into two groups, identified by the vowel of their rhymes. The first, third, fifth stanza use the vowel *a*, the second, fourth, sixth the vowel *ei* in alternating feminine and masculine rhymes. To these rhymes

correspond in content: the past union of the lovers while the nightingale sang (*a*-stanzas); the present solitude of the forsaken girl who sings and spins in the moonlight (*ei*-stanzas).

This duplex situation is carried through a triple period of time:

Group I, stanzas 1 and 2: the past and present in mere juxtaposition;

Group II, stanzas 3 and 4: the past permeates the present, as often as the moonlight revives its memories;

Group III, stanzas 5 and 6: the past is perpetuated and projected into the future with the wish: May God reunite us.

Thus we have a polar dualism as well as the sacred trinity of German Romanticism which Schlegel called the infinite rhythm of time (Strich, p. 305). "The physical is," to quote again a word of Fritz Strich, "transfigured, consumed by fire, and changed to spiritual meaning." This is the reason why the lines with slight alterations remain the same, for nothing but time changes. In the middle of each *a*-rhyme stanza, we have the two rhyme words

Nachtigall	—	Wohl auch die Nachtigall
		Da sang die Nachtigall
		Singt stets die Nachtigall
and Schall	—	Das war wohl süßer Schall
		Nun mahnet mich der Schall
		Ich denk bei ihrem Schall.

In the middle of each *ei*-rhyme stanza, we have the two rhyme words

allein	—	Und spinne so allein
		Gedenk ich dein allein
		Hier spinn ich so allein
and (klar und) rein	—	Den Faden klar und rein
		Mein Herz ist klar und rein
		Der Mond scheint klar und rein.

Moreover, beside this identity of the rhyme words at the identical place, there is an identity of the embracing verses, i. e., the last line of each stanza is repeated as the initial line of the respective following stanza so that, if we number the embracing rhymes of the *a*-stanzas  $a^1, a^2, a^3$ , of the *ei*-stanzas  $ei^1, ei^2, ei^3$ , there results a progression  $a^1-a^2 / ei^1-ei^2 / a^2-a^3 / ei^2-ei^3$  and a retrogression  $a^3-a^2 / ei^3-ei^1$ . The rhyme, however, with which the poem closes, is not the initial rhyme of the poem but that of the second, the *ei*-stanza, so that the ending of the poem does not revert to the

beginning, it remains open and purposely so. We could very well add a seventh stanza which might be imagined to run like this:

Da wir zusammen waren,  
Da sang die Nachtigall,  
Das war wohl süßer Schall  
Vor langen, langen Jahren.

Thus the poem would in fact be closed, the hope for a return of the lover in some future time would be given up, and the ending would revert to the beginning. That Brentano has purposely avoided this, may be inferred from the fact that he introduced into the third line of stanza 6 the words *Mond* and *scheint*, words of the rhyme line  $ei^2$  which now takes its place in numerical retrogression  $ei^3$ ,  $ei^2$ ,  $ei^1$  and establishes at least a secret semi-closure.

All in all, then, this poem, which expresses a lyric mood in simple musical variations, and seems to issue forth from the unconscious, purposeless depth of the soul, is of a crafty, mathematically rational construction, which reveals itself only through minute analysis. It employs non-rationally expressive means in a rational way, quite similar to that of those Gothic architects who achieve their mystical art of building space by throwing the weight of the roof upon carefully calculated outside buttresses. The expression formless would, therefore, hardly fit this most ingeniously constructed poem of a perfect lyric genus-form, open unity-form of a musical type, which at the same time is expression-form of a romantic, subjective consciousness of infinity.

The suppression of one or two stanzas in *Margarete's Monologue at the Spinning Wheel* would destroy the rational as well as the irrational form, unity and expression form; in Brentano the rational part would hardly be disturbed, the irrational form would suffer, but since it is open without an end cadence, it would not be perceptibly changed.

### 3.

#### EICHENDORFF: *MONDNACHT*.

- |                                       |                                    |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Es war als hätt der <b>Himmel</b>  | 2. Die Luft ging durch die Felder, |
| Die <b>Erde</b> still geküßt,         | Die Aehren wogten sacht,           |
| Daß sie im <b>BLÜTENSCHIMMER</b> .    | Es rauschten leis die Wälder,      |
| Von ihm nur <b>TRÄUMEN</b> , müßt.    | So sternklar war die Nacht.        |
| 3. Und meine <b>SEELE</b> spannte     |                                    |
| Weit ihre <b>FLÜGEL</b> aus,          |                                    |
| Flog durch die stillen <b>Lande</b> , |                                    |
| Als flöge sie nach <b>Haus</b> .      |                                    |

Eichendorff's *Mondnacht* may now demonstrate that musical form need not be identical with open form, in fact in most music proper the closed form is preferred. Strich chanced to select for a comparison with Goethe one of Eichendorff's open poems. But already Nadler in his study on *Eichendorffs Lyrik* (Prag 1908) was aware of different structural types in the output of this poet, and it would be worth while to follow up his suggestions with careful melodic analyses.

The first of the three stanzas of *Mondnacht* strikes with its very first words the lyrical chord of complete subjectivity. Not "the sky had kissed the earth so that she dreamed of him" but "it was as if." The third stanza projects this motion in reversed order into the soul of the poet, which now, leaving the earth, flies heavenward. The corresponding symmetrically placed words are: *Himmel-Haus, Erde-Lande, Blütenschimmer-Flügel, träumen-Seele*.<sup>1</sup> And not by chance are the rhymes *spannte-Lande, Himmel-Schimmer* dreamily inexact. Although the tense of the poem is a poetic past, a past, present, and future may again be divined in it. The simple language and sentence structure are entirely non-rational and replete with metaphoric meaning. The correspondence of stanza one and three is reflected in the melodic form, for in 1, each two lines form a downward tending wave, repeated more intensely and with a deeper cadence in 3.

In between these subjective dream reactions the second stanza is inserted, a factual description of the quiet lands in four even melodic planes, tending slightly downward, each one starting almost at the same level, a tone picture of a dream landscape. This middle part could be left out without destroying the meaning of the poem. But if the third stanza were read immediately after the first, the end of the cadence would fall so low that it would be beyond the range of the normal voice on account of the steady fall of the eight descending lines. Only through the fact that the second stanza draws the melody of the poem to a higher level and holds it there, the long closing cadence of the third is made possible.

It thus becomes manifest that the poem was conceived as a melodic unity. In spite of its dreamy indefiniteness, its suggestion of infinity, its entirely musical character (revealed also in the importance of the vowel scales of every line) it presents a closed

<sup>1</sup> Note: Correspondence indicated through varying type in the text above.

melodic form. Schumann in his composition of the song has accentuated these elements very successfully, especially the difference of the second stanza and the relation of the ending to the beginning.

ERNST FEISE

---

TO AN *ALBUMBLATT* OF UHLAND

While Uhland was a delegate to the Frankfort Parliament, his wife accompanied him to that city, and their social intercourse was almost entirely in the home of a Frankfort physician, Dr. Mappes. On May 9, 1849, Frau Uhland wrote in the autograph-album of a daughter of the family the following lines:

Ein weinend Kind lagst du auf Mutters Schooß,  
Als lächelnd rings umstanden dich die Deinen;  
Nun lebe so, daß, wann erfüllt dein Loos,  
Du lächeln mögst, wenn Alle um dich weinen.

Friedrich Notter, in his *Life of Uhland* (Stuttgart, 1863, p. 325 ff.), asserted that these lines were not original: they were, in their essential content, derived from Jean Paul, and had been put into verse-form by some lady, perhaps Karoline Rudolphi. This guess is reproduced in the critical edition of *Uhlands Gedichte* by Schmidt and Hartmann (II, 201).

On May 22, Uhland wrote under these verses, on the same page, his own lines:

Inzwischen wandle frisch hinan  
Die wechselvolle Lebensbahn, . . . etc.

Both poems were first published, after Uhland's death, in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, February 21, 1863.

The stanza under consideration is not contained in any of Karoline Rudolphi's works: there is a poem (I, 132) of eight stanzas, "An ein neugebohrnes Kind," which was perhaps in Notter's thought—but it has no resemblance to the lines in the album.

My son was reading from the *Oxford Book of English Poetry*, and called my attention to a quatrain beginning: "On parent knees, a naked new-born child," attributed there to Sir William Jones. This stanza is not contained in Jones's *Works*, but in his *Life*, by Lord Teignmouth, it is stated that in 1785 a periodical was founded

at Calcutta, under the title, *Asiatick Miscellany*; to the first two volumes (1785 and 1786) Sir William Jones, at that time a magistrate of the Supreme Court in Calcutta, contributed various articles, among them some smaller pieces, "from which," says Lord Teignmouth, "I quote with pleasure, the following beautiful tetrastick, which is a literal translation from the Persian:

On parent knees a naked, new-born child,  
Weeping thou sat'st, while all around thee smil'd:  
So live, that, sinking in thy last long sleep,  
Calm thou may'st smile, when all around thee weep."

There can be no doubt as to the identity of these verses. How Jones's quatrain came to be known in Germany, would be another story.

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD

*Northwestern University*

---

### GERSTÄCKER ÜBER ZEITGENÖSSISCHE SCHRIFTSTELLER

Bei dem Lesen der Schriften Gerstäckers ist man von der Fülle der Zitate überrascht, die zum grösseren Teil *Faust* entnommen sind. Sehr richtig führt George H. R. O'Donnell dies auf die Tatsache zurück, dass Gerstäcker seine Jugendjahre im Hause seiner Tante, der Frau des Direktors Schütz zubrachte, dem die Leitung des Herzöglichen Theaters in Braunschweig unterstand. Er sagt darüber:

The artistic circles at Braunschweig, too, were a tremendous stimulant to the boy; and so deep was the impression made upon him by Goethe's *Faust*, when his uncle put it on the German stage for the first time in 1829, that we find young Gerstäcker quoting it years later while far in the deep wilds of Arkansas—and with at least fair accuracy, too.<sup>1</sup>

Daneben findet Schiller gelegentliche Erwähnung.

Was Gerstäcker an der andern Hand über zeitgenössische Schriftsteller denkt, erhellt seine Korrespondenz mit seinem Verleger, H. Costenoble.<sup>2</sup> Die grössere Anzahl der diesbezüglichen Bemerkungen

<sup>1</sup> *PMLA.*, XLII (1927), S. 1036.

<sup>2</sup> Im Privatbesitz des Herrn Professor Dr. W. Kurrelmeyer, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.



in seinen Briefen bezieht sich auf Dichter, deren stärkste Seite auf dem Gebiete des exotischen Romans zu suchen ist, ähnlich wie bei Gerstäcker selbst. Seine Beurteilung ist in den meisten Fällen durchaus nicht schmeichelhaft. Doch bevor wir uns diesen Kritiken anderer Schriftsteller zuwenden, sei es erlaubt, einige Stellen anzuführen, die zeigen werden, wie hoch Gerstäcker seine eigenen Arbeiten einschätzt. Am 24. August 1864 schreibt er mit Bezug auf seine zwei Romane, *Señor Águila* und *General Franco*:

Die beiden neuen Romane behandeln . . . ein vollkommen neues Feld und sind beide gelungen. In Köln versicherte mir die Redaktion,<sup>3</sup> die das Manuscript gelesen hatte, dass ihr *Señor Águila* noch besser gefiel als die *Colonie*, über die sie mir schon viel Schmeichelhaftes geschrieben.

Bezüglich der Ausstattung seiner Gesamtwerke beruft er sich auf Schriftsteller, die einen bedeutenden Ruf haben:

Was Ihre Anfrage wegen einer grösseren Bändezahl betrifft, mein lieber Herr Costenoble, so kennen Sie meine Ansicht darüber. Alle anständigen Bücher von Edm. Höfer, Auerbach, Gutzkow, Freytag etc. werden in anständigen Bänden und nicht als Leihbibliothekenfutter herausgegeben, und keine Leihbibliothek, die sich das Buch überhaupt anschafft, wird es refüsiren, weil es 4 statt 5 oder sechs Bände hat. . . . Wer es sich aber in seine Bibliothek kauft, möchte doch auch gern vernünftige Bände haben und ich glaube und hoffe, dass besonders in Österreich viel von Privat Personen gekauft werden wird. (7. Juli 1870.)

Als die Vorbereitungen für die Herausgabe der gesammelten Werke erledigt sind, und der Prospekt ihm von Costenoble zugesandt wird, antwortet er im Briefe vom 26. Februar 1872:

Prospekt viel zu schmeichelhaft—ich kann's mir gefallen lassen.

Es wird aus diesen Stellen ersichtlich, dass Gerstäcker eine recht gute Ansicht über seinen eigenen Wert als Schriftsteller hat.

Der erste Dichter, den Gerstäcker in den vorliegenden Briefen erwähnt, ist Möllhausen.<sup>4</sup> Über ihn schreibt er am 6. Juli 1862 an Costenoble:

Apropos die Möllenhaussischen Bücher, über die Sie von mir ein Urtheil wollten. Mein guter Herr Costenoble, ich gebe Ihnen das nicht gern, da Hr. M. gleichen Stoff mit mir behandelt, wenigstens ein gleiches Terrain

---

<sup>3</sup> Wurde zuerst in der *Kölnischen Zeitung* abgedruckt.

<sup>4</sup> Balduin Möllhausen, geboren am 27. Januar 1825 zu Bonn; gestorben am 28. Mai 1905 in Berlin.

hat. So viel kann ich Ihnen aber sagen, dass es meiner Meinung nach der reine Schund ist, & ich meinen Namen nicht um vieles Geld unter einem dieser Bücher haben möchte. Ich möchte mich verbindlich machen, einen solchen Roman einer Anzahl Stenographen in drei Tagen zu diktieren. Das aber natürlich nur unter uns. Die Leihbibliotheken werden sie kaufen, denn es ist deren Futter; Spiess & Kramer in's Amerikanische übersetzt, mit lauter unmöglichen Charakteren.

Ähnlich ist sein Urteil über Hackländer.<sup>5</sup> Im Jahre 1864, als er mit Costenoble bezüglich der Gesamtausgabe seiner Werke unterhandelt, schreibt er:

Was nun unseren Kontract einer Gesamtauflage betrifft, so muss ich da, ehe ich Ihren letzten Brief beantworte, noch einmal auf einen früheren zurückkommen, worin Sie sagen, dass Hackländer verhältnismässig weniger bekäme als ich. Ich wollte Ihnen darauf nur erwidern, dass die Hackländersche Auflage 20 Bände zu je 14 Bogen—Summa 280 Bogen umfasste, und die meinige fast 800—doch das nur nebenbei. (17. März 1864.)

Die Veröffentlichung seines Romans *Die Mutter* in der *Kölnischen Zeitung* wird durch den Abdruck eines Romans Hackländers hingehalten. Gerstäcker gibt seinem Ärger darüber im Briefe vom 4. Dezember 1865 Ausdruck:

Mein neuer Roman in der *Kölnischen Zeitung* hat noch nicht begonnen, da Hackländer einen Bandwurm abdrucken lässt. Wie furchtbar langweilig und breitschweifig dieser *Künstlerroman* sich ausdehnt, ist wahrhaftig nicht zu sagen. Er braucht oft drei, vier ganze Nummern hinter einander, in denen nicht allein gar Nichts geschieht, sondern die auch nicht in der geringsten Verbindung mit der Hauptsache stehn. Ich begreife nicht, dass sich das Publikum so etwas gefallen lässt. Wenn ich so schreiben wollte, könnte ich aus jedem meiner dreibändigen Romane einen zwölfbändigen machen.

Dieser "Bandwurm" erregt wieder seinen Ärger im Briefe vom 8. Januar 1866:

Der erste (*Die Mutter*), der zunächst in der *Köln. Ztg.* abgedruckt wird, wenn Hackländers jetzt dort laufender Bandwurm (beiläufig gesagt das Elendste was H. je geschrieben hat) beendet ist.

Am 9. März lesen wir:

Mit meinem Roman hat mich Hackländer durch einen wahren Bandwurm von Roman, der jetzt seit dem 1sten September in der *Köln. Zeitung* läuft und die Redaktion schon fast zur Verzweiflung gebracht hat, so hinaus-

<sup>5</sup> Friedrich Wilhelm von H., geboren am 1. November 1816 in Burtscheid bei Aachen, gestorben am 6. Juli 1877 in Leoni am Starnberger See.

geschoben, dass der Abdruck derselben erst am 16ten März beginnen kann, also vor Ende April kein Gedanke an Druck ist. Wie langweilig Hackländer's Roman ausgefallen ist, mag Ihnen das beifolgende Spottblatt der Carnevalszeitung beweisen, die ihn persiflirt.

Eine Kritik der Dichterin Louise Mühlbach<sup>6</sup> finden wir ebenfalls in seinen Briefen. Ihre Werke erschienen, wie die Gerstäcker's, zum grössten Teil im Verlag Costenoble. Am 9. Juni 1864 schreibt Gerstäcker:

Zum Verlag der Mühlbach'schen Werke kann ich Ihnen nur gratuliren. Es ist ein entsetzliches Weib mit ihrer Historienmacherei, aber ihre Bücher werden viel gelesen.

Noch einmal erwähnt er den Namen Mühlbach im Briefe vom 25. Juli 1864, wo es heisst:

Noch eins. In der hiesigen Thienemann'schen Buchhandlung hörte ich ein Urtheil über Louise Mühlbach, das ich Ihnen doch nicht vorenthalten will. Sie sagten mir dort nämlich, kein Mensch wolle die Sachen der Dame hier in Gotha mehr lesen und sie ständen wie Blei—ihre Zeit sei vorüber. Ich weiss nicht in wie weit das übertrieben ist, aber ich wollte Sie doch darauf aufmerksam machen.

Was er über die Werke und den Charakter Gutzkow's denkt, erfahren wir im Briefe vom 12. Juni 1870:

Was Sie mir über die Acquisition von Gutzkow's Werken mittheilen hat mich nicht besonders erfreut—Ihretwegen. Erstlich schreibt Gutzkow jetzt so, dass es kein Mensch mehr lesen oder verstehen kann—Versuchen Sie z. B. einmal den ersten Band von *Hohenschwangau* zu lesen & die Sätze zu verstehen—es ist positiv unmöglich und dann dankt Brockhaus z. B. Gott, dass er von ihm frei ist, und Sie halten es nicht weiter wie bis zum Druck des ersten Bandes mit ihm aus, denn er soll die Setzer zur Verzweiflung treiben. Er ändert fortwährend & zwar so, dass der Satz oft umgeworfen werden muss, und Brockhaus hat ihm zuletzt erklärt, dass er wohl die erste Correctur zu ändern ihm gestatten wolle, die zweite & dritte aber, wenn er fortwährend ganze Sätze umschreibt, müsse er selbst bezahlen. Also setzen Sie sich nur besonders darin mit ihm fest, sonst kommen Sie aus dem Ärger nicht heraus.

Nach dieser Bemerkung vergleicht Gerstäcker Gutzkow mit dem Dichter Bodenstedt<sup>7</sup> und sagt über letzteren:

<sup>6</sup> Klara Mundt, geb. Müller, Deckname Luise Mühlbach, geboren am 2. Januar 1814 zu Neubrandenburg, gestorben am 26. September 1873 zu Berlin.

<sup>7</sup> Friedrich von Bodenstedt, geboren am 22. April 1819 zu Peine (Hannover), gestorben am 18. April 1892 zu Wiesbaden.

Etwas anderes ist es mit Bodenstedt, der ist wirklich ein tüchtiger Geist. Ich traf ihn jetzt in Hamburg & Kiel, wo ich war, um unsere Flotte zu besuchen.

Der Druck seines Romans *Señor Águila*, der nach dem Erscheinen in der *Kölnischen Zeitung* beginnen soll, wird durch den "etwas sehr langen Roman von Struensee"<sup>8</sup> verzögert. (2. Juni 1864). Vom 25. Juli 1864 haben wir eine Mitteilung folgenden Inhalts:

Ich war auch in Köln, und frug dort die Redaction, ob denn der endlose Roman von Struensee noch kein Ende nähme, damit mein Roman beginnen könne. Struensee hat sie selber damit überrascht, indem sie glaubten, das ganze Manuscript in Händen zu haben, & dann noch drei Bände dazubekamen.

Ungefähr vier Wochen später (24. August 1864) schreibt Gerstäcker wiederum:

Der jetzige Roman in der Köln. Zeitung nimmt garkein Ende. Die Redact. ist selber unglücklich darüber, denn Struensee hat ihnen das Manuscript gegeben, das drei Bände enthielt, und als das begonnen war noch drei Bände nachgeschickt.

Ein Schriftsteller, für den Gerstäcker sich bei Costenoble wandte, ist der Verfasser eines Romans, der unter dem Namen Ati Kambang schrieb. Die erste Erwähnung eines Romans, der Ati Kambang zum Verfasser hat, ist im Brief vom 6. Januar 1864:

Was den Roman über Rio Janeiro & Australien betrifft, so nehme ich Ihre Bedingungen für meinen Freund an . . . Titel und Vorrede sende ich Ihnen gelegentlich.

Ungefähr drei Wochen später, am 28. Januar 1864 sendet Gerstäcker das versprochene Vorwort:

Der Titel: *die Auswanderer* gefällt mir nicht. Er ist schon zu oft dagewesen. Ich denke wir nennen ihn *Auf fremder Erde*. Der Name ist Ati Kambang (Malayisch) allerdings etwas auffallend, aber das schadet ja Nichts.

Dieser Titel wird dann auch wirklich angenommen. Im Briefe vom 9. Juni 1864 erfahren wir den richtigen Namen des unter dem Pseudonym Ati Kambang schreibenden Schriftstellers. Dies erfolgt in Verbindung mit der Honorarzahlung.

<sup>8</sup> Oberregierungsrat Gustav Otto von Struensee, geboren am 13. Dezember 1803 in Greifenberg, Pommern, gestorben am 29. September 1879 in Breslau. Seine Werke erschienen unter dem Pseudonym Gustav vom See.

Die Quittung habe ich, oder werde ich für Ati Kambang mit meinem eigenen Namen unterzeichnen. Ihnen selber will ich aber den Namen des Verfassers gern nennen, nur mit der Bitte, ihn geheim zu halten. Es ist Dr. Hermann Behr<sup>9</sup> in San Francisco ein bekannter Botaniker & sehr tüchtiger Arzt.

Der nächste Brief an Costenoble (18. Juni 1864) enthält die Quittung:

Um Ihnen zu beweisen, dass ich Ihnen das Buch *Auf fremder Erde* nur aus Interesse für die Sache empfohlen habe, lege ich Ihnen die Quittung über das abgeschickte Geld bei. Ich habe nicht einmal meine Portoauslagen abgezogen—die schwere Arbeit an Manuscript & Correkturen ganz ungerechnet.

Drei Jahre später finden wir wiederum diesen Schriftsteller in Gerstäckers Correspondenz mit Costenoble erwähnt (20. Mai 1867):

Vom Verfasser des (Ati Kambang) *Auf fremder Erde* habe ich wieder einen neuen Roman zugesandt bekommen, der ausserordentlich hübsch zu sein scheint, den ich aber noch keine Zeit hatte zu lesen und durchzusehen.

Am 3. Juli 1867 sendet Gerstäcker das Manuscript an Costenoble:

Anbei folgt der neue Roman von Ati Kambang *Dritte Söhne*, dem ich den Zusatz geben würde *Californisches Lebensbild*. Er ist vortrefflich.

Interessant ist hier eine Stelle aus Arthur H. Hughes' Dissertation "*Aus Karl Gutzkows Briefen an H. Costenoble in Jena.*"<sup>10</sup> Auf Seite 23 dieser Arbeit befindet sich ein Schreiben Gutzkows, das folgendermassen lautet:

Einer meiner Söhne, der sich in Californien befindet, ersucht mich, bei Ihnen um das Schicksal eines Manuscripts zu fragen, das Ihnen Herr Gerstäcker vermittelt haben soll. Der Verfasser desselben ist ein Dr. Behr in Sanfrancisco, der unter dem Namen, Atti Kambang schon Mehres hat drucken lassen. Da ich veranlasst bin, dieser Tage an meinen Sohn zu schreiben, so würden Sie mich verbinden, wenn Sie mir über diesen Gegenstand gefälligst umgehend Nachricht geben wollten. (26. Dezember 1867.)

Nach dem Datum zu urteilen, dürfte sich dieser Brief auf den Behrschen Roman *Dritte Söhne* beziehen. Ob dieser Roman je gedruckt worden ist, ist meiner Ansicht nach zweifelhaft. Kayser<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Gerstäcker erwähnt diesen Namen in den *Ausgewählten Werken, Zweite Volks- und Familien-Ausgabe* von Dietrich Theden, Jena, Hermann Costenoble, 1887-1890, Serie II, Band 10, S. 207.

<sup>10</sup> Maschinenschrift, The Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore, 1931.

<sup>11</sup> Christian Gottlob Kayser, Vollständiges Bücher-Lexicon, Leipzig.

erwähnt wohl den Roman *Auf fremder Erde*,<sup>12</sup> bringt aber keine Erwähnung eines anderen Romans von ihm in späteren Jahren.

Auerbach findet zweimal Erwähnung in Gerstäckers Briefen an Costenoble. Das Verhältnis zwischen den beiden Dichtern scheint zu der Zeit, aus der diese Briefe stammen, ein recht freundschaftliches gewesen zu sein. Am 11. Dezember 1861 berichtet Gerstäcker, dass er ein Exemplar seines *Kunstreiters* Auerbach überreicht habe, der augenblicklich bei ihm weile. Im nächsten Briefe (15. Dezember 1861) schreibt Gerstäcker, dass Auerbach ihm vorgeschlagen hätte, den Titel eines Artikels, *Der Rückmarsch aus dem Amazonasgebiet*, umzuändern, und zwar auf *Achtzehn Monate in Südamerika und seinen deutschen Colonien*, unter welchem Titel es dann später auch im Jahre 1862 in Buchform erschien.

Im Briefe vom 5. Oktober 1866 empfiehlt Gerstäcker den von Appellationsrat Ewald aus Gotha geschriebenen Roman *Nach fünfzehn Jahren* an Costenoble. Er schreibt über Ewald und sein Werk:

Neulich schrieb mir Appellationsrath Ewald aus Gotha, dass er Ihnen sein Manuscript, *Nach fünfzehn Jahren* zum Verlag geschickt habe. Ich war die Veranlassung, dass ein paar Bruchstücke daraus in der *Gartenlaube* abgedruckt wurden, um den Author mehr bekannt zu machen. Die Erzählungen sind meisterhaft geschrieben. Ewald hat ein besonderes Geschick psychologische Conflicte zu schildern. Ich habe das ganze Manuscript von Anfang bis Ende durchgelesen, sogar kleine Aenderungen darin gemacht und halte es für ein vortreffliches Buch.<sup>13</sup>

Der Name eines gewissen Damian von Schütz<sup>14</sup> ist im Briefe vom 20. Mai 1867 erwähnt:

<sup>12</sup> Kayser, Bd. 15, S. 501.

<sup>13</sup> Die Veröffentlichung dieses Werkes wird in Kayser erwähnt. Bd. 17, S. 278.

<sup>14</sup> Kuno Damian Schütz zu Holzhausen, geboren am 15. Februar 1825 zu Tamberg in Nassau, gestorben am 23. Juni 1883 zu Bensheim a./B. Gerstäcker erwähnt ihn in *Achtzehn Monate in Südamerika und dessen deutschen Colonien*, Volks- und Familien-Ausgabe, Band xiv. Er traf letzteren in Peru. Es war Schütz, der die ersten deutschen Auswanderer nach Peru brachte. Gerstäcker verteidigt ihn gegen die Anklage des Menschenverkaufs, dessen Schütz in Deutschland beschuldigt wurde, und stellt ihm auf Grund der Aussagen aus dem Munde von Auswanderern das beste Zeugnis aus. D. v. Schütz' grösster Fehler, Gerstäckers Meinung nach, war, dass er die Versprechen der peruanischen Regierung zu ernst nahm und an sie zu fest glaubte. S. 308 ff. Dazu vergleiche *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Bd. 33, S. 133.

Gleichzeitig hat Damian v. Schütz die Anfrage an mich gestellt, wo er einen ordentlichen Verleger für seine Reiseschilderungen fände. D. v. Schütz war seine halbe Lebenszeit in Süd-Amerika und kennt das Land aus dem Grunde. Er schreibt auch recht gut.

Am Schluss sei es erlaubt, eine Stelle aus seinen Werken anzuführen, die, aus den fünfziger Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts stammend, uns klar zeigt, wie Gerstäcker die literarischen Verhältnisse der damaligen Zeit beurteilte. Es ist dies eine Zeit, wo die Poesie mehr oder weniger zum Spielball der Politik geworden ist und ihre Eigenexistenz verloren hat. An dieser Stelle heisst es:

Unsere ganze Poesie ist zum Teufel gegangen, und die wenigen Dichter, die noch bei uns wie von der Nacht überraschte Tagfalter herumflattern, werfen sich aus lauter Verzweiflung auf das Trostloseste und Unfruchtbarste, was es, so lange die Welt steht, für Poesie nur gegeben hat—auf die Politik.<sup>15</sup>

Gerstäcker ist also gegen eine politische Betätigung des Dichters und stimmt in seinem Urteil mit dem Goethes überein, der in seinen Gesprächen mit Eckermann sagt:

Sowie ein Dichter politisch wirken will, muss er sich einer Partei hingeben, und sowie er dieses thut, ist er als Dichter verloren,

oder, in derselben Verbindung:

Als Mensch und Bürger wird der Dichter sein Vaterland lieben, aber das Vaterland seines poetischen Wirkens sei das Gute, Edle, Schöne.<sup>16</sup>

Zum Vergleich sei ebenfalls eine Stelle aus Heines Werken angeführt. Der ältere Heine sagt Ähnliches in seiner Vorrede zu *Atta Troll*, wo es heisst:

Der leere Kopf pochte jetzt mit Fug auf sein volles Herz, und die Gesinnung war Trumpf.<sup>17</sup>

A. J. PRAHL

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

<sup>15</sup> *Reisen*, Serie II, Bd. x, S. 500.

<sup>16</sup> Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe*, März 1832.

<sup>17</sup> *Heines Werke* von Ernst Elster, Zweite Ausgabe, Bd. III, S. 20.

## A PREDECESSOR OF MOBY-DICK

When Herman Melville gathered together the library of whaling which was to go into the making of *Moby-Dick* he included Joseph C. Hart's anonymous *Miriam Coffin, or the Whale-Fishermen*,<sup>1</sup> a book which possibly helped form the plot of the later and greater novel. *Miriam Coffin* is a complex story of Nantucket during the Revolution. It deals with the title character and her ambitious financial projects; a sort of "glove and lion" story, in which the sympathy is with the lady; and an adventurous whaling voyage.

The whaling voyage to the South Seas occupies only two chapters (nine and ten) of the second volume, but it is of considerable interest. A young man, Thomas Starbuck, sails on the *Leviathan* despite the prophecy of a half-breed squaw that he is to die in a whale's jaws. The *Leviathan* joins the *Grampus*, they visit the "Enchanted Islands" or Gallipagos, then separate, the *Grampus* is attacked by savages, they unite and together lower against a school of whales. Starbuck is beset by premonitions, but enters a boat which ignores the school and sets out after the leader, a monster "of prodigious size" which leads his pursuer "a tiresome chase." The whale sounds, comes up under the boat with open jaws, and Starbuck tumbles into the "living tomb" in fulfillment of the prophecy. The boat and crew are driven into the air by a stroke of the animal's tail. The sequel is worth quoting in full:

The unfortunate crew were rescued in time to witness the last agonies of the desperate whale, which, like Samson crushing the temple in his might, dealt death and destruction on all sides, while he himself was overwhelmed in the general ruin.

The animal, blind with rage, and feeling the sting of the death-wound in his heart, whirled round the ships, in irregular circles, for a short time, and then descended. The crews lay upon their oars, watching where he would next appear, while the ships were hove to, to await the result.

Suddenly a mighty mass emerged from the water, and shot up perpendicularly, with inconceivable velocity, into the air. It was the whale;—and the effort was his last expiring throe!—He fell dead;—but in his descent, he pitched headlong across the bows of the *Grampus*, and, in one fell swoop, carried away the entire fore-part of the vessel!

The crew escaped, by throwing themselves into boats alongside, and rowing quickly off. The gallant ship instantly filled with water, and settled away from their sight.

---

<sup>1</sup> Two vols. New York, 1834.



These are the concluding sentences of the chapter, and nothing more is said of the voyage until, after an intervening section, an account is given of the *Leviathan's* return.

There are two things about the story which deserve particular notice: first, that the account of a whaling voyage is brought to a sudden conclusion by the dramatic sinking of a ship by an unusually large whale; and, second, that the drama of the event is intensified by coupling it with the fulfillment of a prophecy. Melville was certainly impressed by this section of the story, for he chose the first sentence and a half from the third paragraph quoted above for reproduction among the "Extracts" which preface *Moby-Dick*. This, with his use of the similar narrative technique of a dramatic conclusion intensified by prophecy,<sup>2</sup> makes it only reasonable to suppose that *Miriam Coffin* had a not insignificant part in the making of *Moby-Dick*.

The *Grampus* also appears incidentally in *Moby-Dick*; but the use of that appropriate name for a whaling ship is of no more significance than the common use of Quaker Pelegs, and of Coffins, Folgers, Starbucks, Macys, and Colemans—all good Nantucket names which serve to give an air of verisimilitude to both books.

Pomona College

LEON HOWARD

#### AN UNDISCOVERED BIT OF VERSE BY LONGFELLOW

In the library of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Massachusetts, there is a hitherto undiscovered bit of verse written by Longfellow. It is found in an old Valentine. The style and design of the Valentine indicate that it was printed toward the last of Longfellow's life. The verse is printed in a gaudy, inexpensive lace Valentine. There is no maker's name on it. The verse is as follows:

##### THE RIVER

Thou hast taught me, silver river,  
Many a lesson deep and long;  
Thou hast been a generous giver,  
I can give thee but a song.

<sup>2</sup> It might be worth recalling that Elijah and the Parsee were not the only prophets in *Moby-Dick*; a "squaw" had foretold that Ahab's name "would somehow prove prophetic" (chap. xvi).

Of in sadness and in illness  
 I have watched thy current glide,  
 Till the beauty of its stillness  
 Overflowed me like a tide.  
 And in better hours and brighter,  
 When I saw thy waters gleam,  
 I have felt my heart grow lighter  
 And leap onward with thy stream.

Longfellow.

This verse is not included in any of the collections of the works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

ESTHER C. AVERILL

5 Rupert Street,  
 Worcester, Mass.

## DANTE NOTES

### I. "THE LAKE OF THE HEART" (*Inf.*, I, 20)

When Dante, lost and frightened, saw the first beams of the morning sun upon the hilltop, he was somewhat reassured; he says:

Allor fu la paura un poco queta  
 che nel lago del cor m'era durata  
 la notte ch'io passai con tanta pièta. (*Inf.*, I, 19-21.)

The figure of the "lake of the heart" has been understood by practically all the commentators to refer to a lake of blood; and Dante's own expression in *Rim.*, CIII, 45-7,<sup>1</sup> has been cited, among others, as confirmatory.

But while the picture of a lake of blood is by no means off color in the *Divine Comedy*,<sup>2</sup> there is a passage in the *Rime dubbie* which

<sup>1</sup> "E 'l sangue, ch'è per le vene disperso, Fuggendo corre verso Lo cor, che 'l chiama; ond'io rimango bianco."

<sup>2</sup> *E. g.*, there is the well-known passage in *Inf.*, X, 86, which refers to the Battle of Montaperti as having "l'Arbia colorata in rosso"; while Canto IX of *Par.* may almost be said to make a feature of similar concepts: 55 f.: "la bigoncia Che ricevesse il sangue ferrarese"; 92 f.: "la terra ond'io fui. Che fè del sangue suo già caldo il porto"; and very likely also 46 f.: "Padova al palude Cangerà l'acqua che Vicenza bagna." In support of this interpretation of the last passage may be offered the following two Biblical parallels (which, to my knowledge, have not hitherto been adduced), both punishments for obstinacy and neglect of duty: *Exod.*,

strongly suggests quite a different interpretation. Vss. 8-9 of III, 5, have the same phrase: "una saetta, che m' asciuga il lago *Del cor* . . ."; and this is explained in the prose exposition which follows as meaning "una saetta calda di tanto ardore, ch' asciuga il lago delle *lagrime* del mio cuore; perchè s'io non posso venire a torre quella che promessa mi fu, non è meraviglia se mia vita si converte in lagrime, che veramente si possono chiamar lago."<sup>3</sup>

This meaning, "lake of *tears*," really does seem to fit in better than the usual interpretation with Dante's condition at the beginning of his desperate journey: he twice refers to his *weeping* with fear, before Vergil reassures him by promising to rescue him, first in describing his terror at the she-wolf, vss. 55-7 ("qual è quei . . . Che'n tutt' i suoi pensier *piange* e s'attrista"); and then in the clause of vs. 92 ("poi che *lagrimar* mi vide").

The thought of tears as welling up from the heart is a widespread conception, however unscientific; certainly poets have exploited the idea often.<sup>4</sup> There is an interesting exposition of the *modus operandi* of this phenomenon, in the *Libro di Sidrach*, which is about contemporary with Dante's last years; as well as a curious verbal and conceptual analogy with the simile which immediately follows the *terzina* that comes after our "lago del cor": ". . . lo cuore che è tenero e puro, incontanente che ode cosa che gli dispiaccia, si la pensa e *guata*" (cf. *Inf.*, I, 24: "si volge a l'acqua

VII, 17-20, esp. 19: "Dixit quoque Dominus ad Moysen: Dic ad Aaron: Tolle virgam tuam, et extende manum tuam super aquas Aegypti, et super fluvios eorum, et rivos, ac *paludes*, et omnes lacus aquarum, ut *revertantur in sanguinem*; et sit *cruor* in omni terra Aegypti, tam in ligneis vasis" (cf. "bigoncia" of Dante's vs. 55) "quam in saxeis" (cf. also *Psalm.*, LXXVII, 44; CIV, 29); *II Mach.*, XII, 16: "Et capta civitate per Domini voluntatem, innumerabiles caedes fecit, ita ut *adjacens stagnum* stadiorum duorum latitudinis, *sanguine* interfectorum *fluere* videretur." Furthermore, the verb *cangiare* (*cambiare*) is used of changing *color* in *Inf.*, III, 101; and in *Purg.*, XXXIII, 6 ("a la croce si cambiò Maria"), it is even used without the object "colore," in that sense, as the context shows: *ibid.*, 9 ("colorata come foco").

<sup>3</sup> *Rim. dub.*, III, 7.—Torraca, in his Commentary, quoted this passage from the verse part; but, apparently, did not think to look ahead into the prose explanation, and so remained undisturbed in his acceptance of the usual interpretation.

<sup>4</sup> It is the main theme, for example, of the sonnet by Rustico di Filippo which begins: "Amor, onde vien l'acqua, che lo core Algli occhi, senza mai rifinar, manda?"

perigliosa e guata"); "e sale l'acqua della sua tenerezza suso agli occhi; allora piange e getta l'acqua fuori, per travaglio e per angoscia, che à il cuore."<sup>5</sup>

## II. APOLLO AND MARSYAS (*Par.*, I, 19-21)

Midway in the invocation to Apollo with which the *Paradiso* is introduced comes the *terzina*:

Entra nel petto mio, e spira tue  
sì come quando Marsia traesti  
de la vagina de le membra sue.

In the coupling here of the imperative, "spira," with the Marsyas myth there is a difficulty which many commentators seem not to have sensed, while others resort to rather tortuous paraphrasings; but which is a serious problem, in fact, if we understand Dante to have had that conception of the story which is standard. During that famous contest of skill Marsyas played upon the reed pipe which had been thrown away by Minerva; but Apollo's instrument was his beloved lyre. The words "breathe thou in such wise as when thou drewest Marsyas," etc., then, should mean something like: "inspire me so that my poetical (musical) ability may equal thine during the contest with Marsyas."<sup>1</sup> But the plain and unescapable intention of the Poet is not that at all, apparently; the words say explicitly: "breathe as [*thou didst breathe*] when" the contest with Marsyas took place; and, that being the fact, it is surprising how many of the expositors have allowed themselves to commit the absurdity of paraphrasing: "inspire me as when thou didst flay Marsyas," or: "speak [by my mouth] as when," etc. Certainly Apollo did not inspire Marsyas; and we are not told that he made any remarks at the time, either; his deed spoke louder than any words could have done.

<sup>5</sup> *Il libro di Sidrach* (ed. by A. Bartoli; Bologna, 1868), p. 220. Is not the same concept present in *Joan.*, XIX, 34: "Sed unus militum lancea latus ejus aperuit, et continuo exivit sanguis, et aqua"? The Bible expositors have been much puzzled over this.

<sup>1</sup> Buti, for example, did his level best to get continuity and sense out of the passage, *viz.*: "Senso: Inspirami in modo, che io sia atto a cantare con quella potente dolcezza che tu spiegasti allorquando, provocato da Marsia a chi meglio suonava, o egli la cornamusa, o tu la cetra, tu di lunga mano il vincesti."

The real explanation, I am convinced, is quite different; namely, that Dante understood that Apollo too played a *reed* during the contest; and that the verb "spira" in our passage, while used primarily as a call for *inspiration*, also, by an easy shift of aspect, suggested, or was deliberately planned to connect up with, the idea of *breathing* into the reed pipe, in order to draw from it the sweet sounds; sweet to all but the presumptuous Marsyas, to whom they meant divine unmasking, just and terrible punishment; tones of righteous indignation and denunciation such as Dante, with divine aid, now hoped to utter against the profaners of God's majesty. And my grounds for such a belief are far from arbitrary. For in none of the authorities for the details of the Marsyas story with which we may reasonably expect Dante to have been familiar, so far as I have been able to discover, is it at all clear that Apollo was not also playing on a reed. Ovid, *Metam.*, vi, 383-85, says, concerning the musical instrument(s) used, only: ". . . satyri remiscitur alter, Quem Tritoniaca Latous harundine victum Adfecit poena"; Lucan, iii, 205 f., gives no hint that Apollo used a different instrument from Marsyas's;<sup>2</sup> Statius, *Theb.*, ii, 666, has: "Foeda Celaenaea committere proelia buxo"; Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, v, 29, 106, says: "Ubi certavit tibiaram cantu cum Apolline, Aulocrene est."<sup>3</sup>

It would, of course, be rash to affirm that no authorities were available from which Dante could have got the true form of the myth in question; but as an evidence that it is probable that the Middle Ages, in general, understood that Apollo too was piping on a reed, it should be noted that our own Chaucer also seems to have understood it in the same way: in the *House of Fame*, iii, 139-42, he not only makes Marsyas out a woman, but also leads one to believe that he thought Apollo's instrument and Marsyas's to have been of the same type:

And Marcia that lost her skin,  
Bothe in face, body, and chin,  
For that she wolde envyen, lo!  
To *pypen bet then* Apollo.

---

<sup>2</sup> ". . . quae tua munera, Pallas, Lugent damnatae Phoebo victore Celaenae."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Livy, xxxviii, 13, 6: ". . . et Marsyas amnis, haud procul a Maeandri fontibus oriens, in Maeandrum cadit, famaue ita tenet, Celaenis Marsyan cum Apolline *tibiaram cantu* certasse."

If this be the explanation, there is no need for straining at the interpretation of Dante's words. Let Apollo inspire him, that his own voice may sound forth in triumphant strains of stern judgment, even as had Apollo's divine music when he breathed into the "vocal reed."

H. D. AUSTIN

*University of Southern California*

---

### LE SACRIFICE OF LECONTE DE LISLE

In the *Poèmes et poésies* of Leconte de Lisle, 1855, is a sonnet entitled *Le Sacrifice*. In his *Derniers poèmes*, 1895, is a 16-line poem with the same title, composed, according to "Jean Dornis," in 1894. In the two poems, only two lines, 8 and 14 of 1895, are absolutely identical, though there are resemblances in other lines. Of the later poem, Estève says: "Les derniers vers, ou à peu près, qu'il écrivit, ce sont des vers d'amour, ces strophes du *Sacrifice* . . . où il souhaite de souffrir et de mourir pour celle qu'il aime." (*Leconte de Lisle, l'homme et l'oeuvre*, p. 218). Does a comparison of the two poems substantiate this conclusion?

The 1855 poem, which seems clearly to treat of love, runs as follows:

Pour atteindre aux sommets dont la hauteur accable  
Il faut que le pied saigne aux angles du rocher:  
Les dieux aiment le sang. Rien ne les peut toucher  
Que le supplice offert du juste ou du coupable.  
C'est la rigide loi du monde périssable.  
Quand l'homme, un jour, du ciel voulut se rapprocher,  
L'holocauste sanglant fuma sur le bûcher,  
Et l'odeur en monta vers la nue implacable.  
Nous n'avons plus de dieux, plus d'expiations;  
Mais dans nos cœurs en proie aux sombres passions  
L'amère volupté de souffrir reste encore;  
Et je voudrais, victime et sacrificateur,  
Répandant à tes pieds amour, haine et douleur,  
Baigner de tout mon sang l'autel où je t'adore!

The 1895 poem ends:

Mais si le ciel est vide et s'il n'est plus de Dieux,  
L'amère volupté de souffrir reste encore,  
Et je voudrais, le cœur abîmé dans ses yeux,  
Baigner de tout mon sang l'autel où je l'adore!

In this version, the first twelve lines deal solely with the idea of literal and bloody sacrifice; the 14th might refer either to that or to love; it is possible to construe 15-16 as love-verses. But it is to be noted that in this later version the poet omits the word "amour," that hearts are no longer "en proie aux sombres passions," that "tes pieds" becomes "ses yeux," and that at the climax "je t'adore" becomes "je l'adore." In the 1855 preface, Leconte de Lisle says remorsefully that this book "n'est que trop personnel." The most personal love-poems in it, *Les bois, lavés par les rosées*, and *Tre fila d'oro*, were never reprinted. The idea of sacrificial blood, so stressed in the first twelve lines, was dear to Leconte de Lisle, as appears in his fine poem *Le voeu suprême* (*Poèmes barbares*). The concluding lines of the 1895 *Sacrifice* might well refer to a personified image of Sacrifice, rather than to a loved woman. I believe that the poet, in his old age, deliberately changed his love-poem into a hymn to Sacrifice, and that "l'amère volupté de souffrir" concerns man's struggle with fate rather than the sorrow of love.

GEO. N. HENNING

*George Washington University*

---

## UN RÉSUMÉ DE QUELQUES ANNÉES DE LA VIE DE BUFFON. LETTRE INÉDITE

La lettre <sup>1</sup> de Buffon que nous reproduisons ici, et que nous croyons inédite, n'apprendra rien de vraiment nouveau sur cet écrivain. On sait depuis longtemps déjà qu'il intenta un procès à son père, qu'il travailla dans le Département de la Marine, qu'il devint Intendant du Jardin du Roi et Trésorier de l'Académie des Sciences. Cependant, on ne lira pas sans intérêt le récit de ces événements fait par le naturaliste lui-même. Cette lettre est belle d'ailleurs. C'est l'expression d'une amitié sincère et respectueuse qui mérite de venir s'ajouter, dans la correspondance publiée de Buffon, à d'autres souvenirs semblables.

<sup>1</sup> M. William Falls, professeur à l'Université de Maryland, a bien voulu nous signaler cette lettre qui appartient à la collection d'autographes (Simon Gratz) de la Société historique de Pensylvanie. Nous la croyons écrite entièrement de la main de Buffon, et nous la reproduisons intégralement en conservant l'orthographe de l'auteur.

A qui cette lettre fut-elle adressée? Il semble que ce soit à un habitant de Genève. Le M. Jallabert dont parle Buffon est vraisemblablement Jean Jallabert (1712 [13?]-1768), physicien genevois. Son nom se retrouvera en 1750 parmi ceux des personnes devant recevoir un exemplaire gratuit de l'*Histoire naturelle* lors de la distribution des trois premiers volumes de cet ouvrage.<sup>2</sup> Puis le destinataire de cette lettre avait contribué, semble-t-il, à "faire valoir" certains livres qu'il avait envoyés par la suite à Buffon, et qui étaient apparemment les œuvres de Jacques Bernoulli (1654-1705), mathématicien suisse. Or, Gabriel Cramer (1704-1752), savant genevois, et ami de Jean Jallabert, a donné en 1744 une édition des œuvres de ce mathématicien après avoir fait paraître deux ans plus tôt celles du frère, Jean Bernoulli (1667-1748).<sup>3</sup> Il nous semblerait dès lors que cette lettre fut adressée à Gabriel Cramer. Notre conclusion paraît plus justifiée encore lorsqu'on voit que le correspondant de Buffon dont il est question ici s'intéressait à Leibniz, car Cramer devait publier en 1745 un ouvrage intitulé *Vir. cel. Guil. Leibnitii Joh. Bernoullii commercium philosophicum et mathematicum*.<sup>4</sup>

on ne peut pas avoir plus de tort avec quelqu'un mon très cher monsieur, que je me trouve en avoir avec vous aujourd'hui; depuis Le temps que vous avez commencé à avoir quelqu'amitié pour moy vous n'avez pas cessé de m'en donner des marques; <sup>5</sup> malgre mon silence et ma negligence apparente vous n'avez pas discontinué de m'aimer, vous ne sauriez croire combien j'ai été sensible a toutes ces preuves de vos sentiments; puisque

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Correspondance générale de Buffon*, XIII, 61 (cette correspondance fut publiée par Nadault de Buffon comme les volumes XIII et XIV de l'édition des œuvres de Buffon par J.-L. de Lanessan, Paris, Le Vasseur, 1884-1885, 14 vol. in-8).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Jean Senebier, *Histoire littéraire de Genève* . . . (Genève, chez Barde, Manget et compagnie, 1786, 3 vol. in-12), III, 109; et Albert de Montet, *Dictionnaire biographique des Genevois et des Vaudois* . . . (Lausanne, Georges Bridel, 1877, 2 vol. in-8), I, 212.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Senebier, *op. cit.*, p. 109; et Montet, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

<sup>5</sup> En 1744, Buffon entretenait depuis longtemps des relations avec Cramer. Nous savons par la *Correspondance générale* (XIII, 56) du naturaliste que douze ans plus tôt il envoyait au Genevois des lettres et des livres. Les deux hommes se sont d'ailleurs connus personnellement, mais il est malaisé de déterminer la date de leur première rencontre. Une belle amitié les liait en 1748 après un séjour que Cramer venait de faire à Paris, et pendant lequel Buffon l'avait vu et estimé (*ibid.*, 56). S'étaient-ils déjà



vous avez eu asses de bonté pour ne me pas oublier dans le temps et le tres longtemps que j'avois L'air de ne pas penser à vous, je suis persuade que vous recevres volontiers mes excuses. je puis vous assurer avant toutes choses que je n'ai pas cessé et que je ne cessarai jamais de vous être tendrement attache. je vous demande pardon de ma conduite, mon cœur n'a aucune part à mon silence, il m'a mil fois parlé pour vous. Mais si vous savies mon cher monsieur dans quel tourbillon d'affaires et d'occupations de toute espèce j'ai été entraîné depuis sept ou huit ans vous series bientot disposé a oublier pour toujours mes mauvais procédés. permettes moy en faveur de cette ancienne amitié qui m'est si cher de vous en faire un petit detail. il y a huit ans que Le ministre me donna ordre de travailler dans la marine, j'ai travaillé pendant trois ans a des choses pressantes et pressées qui ne m'ont pas laissé pendant tout ce temps ce précieux loisir qu'on emploie si agréablement pour soy et pour ses amis, j'ai ensuite été nommé à la place d'Intendant du jardin du Roy, nouvelle besogne et toute differente de celle que je venois d'achever, mais qui m'a jusqu'icy encore plus occupé, et dont j'espere que quelque jour vous voudres bien vous assurer. Lorsque je ferai imprimer le catalogue historique d'un Cabinet immense de curiosités naturelles que j'ai mises en ordre, enfin on m'a donné il y a quelques mois la place de trésorier de l'Académie qui demande aussi du détail et de l'assiduité; mais tout cela n'est encore rien en comparaison des affaires de famille qui m'ont troublé, mon père a fait un second mariage qui m'a fait tort, il a falu proceder, agir, plaider pour ne pas tout perdre et il n'y a pas longtemps que je suis tranquille a cet egard, pardones moy tout ce détail mon cher monsieur ou plutot prenés le pour une preuve du désir sincere que j'ai d'être toujours du nombre de vos amis. je vous fais mes tres humbles remerciements des beaux livres que vous avez eu la bonté de m'envoyer; j'ai reçu les ouvrages de M. Jean Bernoulli dans le temps et j'ai envoyé prendre hier ceux de Jacques Ches David<sup>6</sup> qui m'avoit remis votre Lettre. tous ceux qui vous connaissent trouvent qu'il est fort heureux pour les sciences que vous voulies bien vous occuper à faire valoir les ouvrages des autres; personne ne peut le faire avec plus de Lumiere et de

---

rencontrés? Nous ne pouvons l'affirmer. Le savant genevois avait quitté sa patrie en 1727 pour voyager une première fois en France et en d'autres pays de l'Europe, mais il ne semble pas avoir fait alors connaissance avec Buffon qui, à cette date, poursuivait encore ses études en province (cf. Senebier, *op. cit.*, p. 105; et la *Correspondance générale de Buffon*, XIII, 2-3). Senebier, d'ailleurs, en dressant la liste des Français avec qui le Genevois se lia pendant son premier séjour en France, ne mentionne pas le futur naturaliste. A en croire cet historien, Cramer et Buffon se seraient rencontrés en 1730 lors d'un voyage que celui-ci aurait fait à Genève (cf. Senebier, *op. cit.*, p. 107). Cela semble cependant peu probable. On ne trouve ailleurs aucune trace de ce voyage.

<sup>6</sup> Ne serait-il pas question de Michel-Antoine David, dit David l'aîné, associé à l'entreprise de la publication de l'*Encyclopédie*? Cf. Joseph Le Gras, *Diderot et l'Encyclopédie* (Paris, Malfere, 1928), p. 35.

discernement, mais vous pouvés nous donner de si grandes choses de vous même que nous avons quelque regret au temps que vous n'employés pas pour vous. je vous dirai que la longue lettre que vous m'avés écrit en defense de Leibnitz m'a occupé pendant quelques jours et que je voulais vous envoyer il y a pres de trois ans une longue reponse, elle est plus de moitié faite et depuis ce temps je n'ai pas eu le temps. je conviens avec vous de beaucoup de choses mais je crois que vous conviendrés avec moy de quelques autres. quoi qu'il en soit je soumettrai à votre jugement mes reflections des que j'aurai quelque Loisir, et je compte bien cultiver dans la suite votre amitié par une correspondance plus exacte. j'ai remis cette lettre à M. David l'aine qui doit vous l'envoyer avec quelques petits livres que je vous supplie de recevoir. faites moy encore la grace d'assurer Mr. Jallabet [Jallabert] de mon attachement et croies moy je vous en supplie l'homme du monde qui vous est le plus entierement dévoué. c'est dans ces sentiments que je serai toute ma vie mon cher monsieur votre tres humble et tres obeist. serviteur

Buffon

au jardin du Roy le 4<sup>e</sup> Avril 1744

University of Maryland

MARGARET HERBING

### GUEZ DE BALZAC AND TASSO

Guez de Balzac was an ardent admirer of Tasso and preferred him to other Italian writers. In his letters he urged his friends to read "la divine Ierusalem",<sup>1</sup> and he read passages from his own copy to his niece. "Faites-la tousjours souvenir," he writes to his sister, "que des quatre belles que je lui ay montrées dans mon Tasse, il n'y en a qu'une dont l'exemple luy soit propre [Sofronia]." <sup>2</sup>

Balzac's judgments on the *Gerusalemme liberata* have been cited in Dr. H. Vogler's dissertation.<sup>3</sup> Except for the distasteful mingling of Christian and pagan elements and the over-refined verses of the Olindo-Sofronia episode, which are not "de la dignité du Poëme héroïque", Balzac has only praise for Tasso's poem; he considers it "l'ouvrage le plus riche et le plus achevé qui se soit veu depuis le siècle d'Auguste."<sup>4</sup> But Dr. Vogler omits all mention of Balzac's most interesting opinion of Tasso, shared by

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Œuvres*, Paris, 1665, I, 346; *Entretiens*, 1600, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres*, I, 316-317.

<sup>3</sup> *Die literargeschichtlichen Kenntnisse und Urteile des Jean-Louis Guez de Balzac*. (Kiel diss.), Altona, 1906, p. 183.

<sup>4</sup> *Œuvres*, II, 537-8, 626.

the majority of his *précieux* contemporaries, viz., that the *Gerusalemme* was an inexhaustible source of quotations. Balzac evidently read the poem pen in hand, jotting down lines and half lines which might later be used advantageously, or at least eruditely, in his letters and essays (the two are one for his generation). In his text, they lack utterly the freshness and spontaneity of Madame de Sévigné's quotations.<sup>5</sup> "Voyez comme je suis soigneux de tenir ma promesse," he writes after having quoted Tasso, "et suivre votre exemple, en vous faisant de petits présents de belles fleurs cueillies au jardin des Muses, et cultivées par les plus habiles mains du Parnasse."<sup>6</sup> This type of "italianism" is typical of the polite and learned society of the times. The largest collection of these somewhat desiccated "fleurs cueillies au jardin des Muses" is found in Balzac's letters to Conrart; they are nearly all from Italian gardens. Conrart knew very little Greek and Latin, but was well grounded in Italian and Spanish. Balzac, eager to please, restricts his show of erudition with this correspondent to the readily comprehensible, and writes:

Je me retranche aux Roses & aux Oeillets de vos grands amis le Pétrarque et le Tasse, dont les couleurs sont si vives, & l'odeur si bonne, qu'elles se conservent sans dechet, & dans leur propre terrior, & lors mesme qu'on les transplante."<sup>7</sup>

Since Dr. Vogler has identified few of the Italian quotations, the sources of which Balzac here indicates in a general way, it is perhaps worth while to give chapter and verse for those taken from Tasso, if for no other reason than to show the extent of this curious type of "influence". The exact references, supplementing the scanty remarks of Vogler, may be of interest to students of Balzac and of Tasso.<sup>8</sup> In the following list of quotations, the reference at the left is to vol. I of Balzac's *Œuvres* (1665), that at the right to canto and verse of the *Gerusalemme liberata*.

<sup>5</sup> Madame de Sévigné quotes certain verses from memory in a letter to her daughter, and adds: "Vous rajusterez ces vers; mais quand ils se trouvent au bout de la plume, il faut qu'ils passent." Cf. Clara Friedmann, "La coltura italiana di Madame de Sévigné," *Giornale storico*, LX, 1 sq.

<sup>6</sup> *Lett. fam. à Chapelain*, Paris, 1659, p. 199.

<sup>7</sup> *Œuvres*, I, 926.

<sup>8</sup> Quotations from Petrarch, in addition to those mentioned by Vogler, may be found in Balzac's *Œuvres*, I, 939, 943, 944, 959, 965, 975, 987, 989, and *Lettres* (to Chapelain), ed. Tamisey de Larroque, 1873, p. 534.

- P. 399 Amando in te ciò, ch'altri invidia e teme  
 Ama il valore, e volontario elegge  
 Teco unirsi d'amore, se non di legge. II, 63
- 929 Sono i vezzi esca d'amore. II, 20
- 931 Nè cosa è mai che gli s'ardisca opporre. I, 75
- 932 Compagne elette a le fortune avverse. IV, 54
- 933 Ciò ch' ascolt' ogn' età, nulla l'estingua. I, 36
- 935 Nulla speme più resta, in van mi doglio. IV, 71
- 935 No 'l soffrir tu, nè già soffrir lo dei;  
 Ma ciò che puoi dimostra, e ciò che sei. V, 22
- 938 A cui non è chi d'agguagliar si vante XVII, 31
- 939 tu me conoscer dei . . .  
 E degno pur d'esser amato sei. XIX, 80
- 941 Onde haver posso aiuto. III, 65
- 943 E risuona più ch'uomo in sue parole. XIII, 52
- 944 Con quella man cui nessun pondo è grave. XIX, 36
- 944 Nò, nò, più non potrei, vinto mi chiamo XIII, 49
- 945 A giorno reo, notte più rea succede,  
 E di peggior di lei, dopo lei vede. XIII, 53
- 946 Che l'Huom d'esser mortal, par che si sdegni,  
 O nostra mente cupida, e superba! XV, 20
- 946 La fama ch' invaghisce à un dolce suono,  
 Voi, superbi Mortali, e par si bella,  
 E' un Echo, un sogno, anzi del sogno un'ombra,  
 Ch' ad ogni, vento si dilegua, e sgombra. XIV, 63
- 946 . . . a chi più deggio  
 Ceder homai? Se tu non sei, no'l veggio. V, 9
- 947 Pronta man, pensier fermo, animo audace. VIII, 65
- 948 Porge più di timor, che di speranza. V, 35
- 950 Degne d'un chiaro sol, degne d'un pieno  
 Teatro, opre sarian si memorande. XII, 54
- 950 Huom che 'n amor m'è padre. XII, 6
- 952 Al cui valor' ogni vittoria è certa. II, 69
- 953 E già ne l'arti mie me stesso avanzi. IV, 24
- 954 Quindi l'ardir, quindi la speme nasce;  
 Pur ch'ella mai non c'abbandoni e lasce,  
 Poco dobbiam curar ch'altri ci manche. II, 85
- 954 Sfortunato silenzio! . . . XIX, 97
- 954 . . . come hai per uso,  
 Mostri amico voler, e saggia mente. XIX, 130
- 954 Che di pietà m'insegna insolite arti. XIX, 112
- 956 E la difficoltà cresce le voglie. XIX, 75
- 956 E del periglio, e de l'opre campagno. II, 4
- 957 Huom ch'a l'alta fortuna agguaglia 'l merto. I, 41
- 957 Il mio desir, tu che puoi sol adempi. IV, 62
- 959 E' di se stesso a se fregio assai chiaro. II, 60
- 961 Risponderà con l'opre a l'alte spene  
 Di lui concetta, & al comun desire. XIV, 26

963 Onde a ragion gl' è quel honor dovuto.	XIX, 117
964 E' tua mercede, e m'è l'onor gradito.	II, 81
965 E legge sia ciò che te sol comandi.	II, 48
965 Mira con quante forze il Ciel t'aiti!	XVIII, 92
967 Nuovo favor del Ciel in lui riluci,	
Che 'l fa grande, & augusto, oltra il costume.	XX, 7
969 . . . o divien nulla, o nulla appare.	XV, 8
969 . . . risuona	
Un non sò che di flebile e soave	
Ch' al cor mi scende, & ogni duol'ammorza.	XII, 66
972 Apprendete pietà quinci, ô mortali!	XVIII, 89
972 L'ultimo don ch' io ti domando, è questo.	XIX, 110
972 Consolar il mio duol di tue parole.	XIX, 108
973 Tanto di gloria a la feminea mano	
Concesse il cielo! . . .	XX, 32
974 Bellezze incorruttibili e divine!	XVIII, 12
976 Torbide notti, e tenebrosi giorni	
Misero vivo . . .	XIX, 83
978 Quella che non uccide, atterra almanco.	XIX, 42
978 Può forse al Ciel' agevolar la strada.	XIX, 118
981 E non già tal ch'a lui resister possi.	III, 14
984 E vive ne le vene occulto foco	
Che pascendo, le strugge a poco a poco.	XIII, 61
985 Quest'è quel che più inaspra i miei martiri.	IV, 10
985 E già morto a' diletti, al duol sol vivo.	IV, 36
986 Vengon da te le medicine, e i mali.	IV, 92
986 Esca aggiungendo a l'inflammato petto.	V, 25
986 Et hora, & dopo un corso ancor di lustri	
Inflammati ne sian gl'animi illustri.	VIII, 37
988 Tanto vigor di mente, e di parole.	XVII, 8
988 Quanto egli può, tanto voler osasse.	VIII, 71
988 . . . A che pagnar col fato?	
Nè più che 'l Ciel si voglia amiam la vita.	X, 37
989 Così congiunta la concorda coppia	
Ne la fida union le forze adoppia.	XX, 35
989 Questo è saver, questa è felice vita;	
Sì l'insegna Natura, e sì l'addita.	XIV, 64

The works of Balzac contain several other quotations from Tasso, but their provenance is indicated by the context and they have been mentioned by Vogler.<sup>9</sup>

CHANDLER B. BEALL

*University of Oregon*

---

<sup>9</sup> *Loc. cit.* V.'s reference to I, 620, should read: II, 620.

### DRYDEN AND THE COLLEGES

The problem of John Dryden's designs in regard to the various Oxford colleges has been reopened to discussion by Professor Louis Bredvold's article in these pages, April, 1931.<sup>1</sup> Therein he indicated a certain unwillingness to accept my suggestion, first advanced in *The London Mercury*, that the laureat's many Oxford prologues and epilogues were composed partly in view of securing the good will of the colleges toward some future academic preferment, and that his protracted campaign to this end came almost to success in 1687, when rumors were in circulation of his probable appointment to the Presidency of Magdalen College.<sup>2</sup> After some question whether these reports were anything more than long-distance gossip, Professor Bredvold proceeded apparently to reinforce my suggestion by producing another report of the same year, connecting Dryden with the post of Warden of All Souls. But this also he would distrust on the strength of certain contemporary documents.

A careful survey of Dryden's various addresses and the addition of new evidence has convinced me of the essential truth of my position. The poet's interest in the Oxford colleges seems to have been one of long continuance. Even before rumor began to connect them with his name, there is the likelihood that he had for some time contemplated a position of honor at Oxford as the best solution to his financial and social difficulties, and the way of life most consonant with his temper. His addresses to the university public, were they to be quoted in full, might afford fairly convincing evidence. A single remark, however, from an Oxford epilogue of 1674 will suffice:

Oft has our poet wish'd, this happy seat  
Might prove his fading Muse's last retreat:  
I wonder'd at his wish, but now I find  
He here sought quiet and content of mind  
Which noiseful towns, and courts can never know,  
And only in the shades like laurels grow.  
Youth, ere it sees the world, here studies rest,  
And age returning thence concludes it best.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *MLN.*, XLVI, 218 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *London Mercury*, XXI, 421.

<sup>3</sup> *The Poetical Works of John Dryden*. Ed. Noyes, Cambridge (1908), p. 76.

That so downright a declaration has been overlooked by Dryden's biographers may perhaps be explained by the contradictory nature of other remarks. Thus, in a letter to Rochester, probably of the preceding year, he had written in another vein :

Because I deal not in satyr, I have sent your Lordship a Prologue and Epilogue which I made for our players, when they went down to Oxford. I hear they have succeeded; and by the event Your Lordship will judge how easy 'tis to pass any thing upon an University, and how gross flattery the learned will endure.\*

If we were to attempt, however, to sound the duplicities of John Dryden in these early years, we might never touch bottom. In a choice between the tone of his Oxford speeches and the arrant sycophancy of this particular letter to Rochester, one might better be advised to accept the honesty of the former.

And why, in this immediate concern, should Dryden not have been sincere? From the moment that he allied himself to the Royal Society, through a long succession of letters, dedications, and critical tracts, he seems consciously to have espoused the world of learning, frequently at the expense of that of poetry. This may be explained as merely the intellectual interest of an active mind. Nor, at first glance, does an epilogue appear a suitable medium for the advancement of his ambition. Let it be remembered, however, that Oxford was surprisingly interested in the contemporary theatre, even amongst highest circles, and particularly in the prologues and epilogues of Dryden, if their number and the notable collections of them in the various college libraries be admissible evidence. He was the recognized master of the form; his audience deeply attentive. But let us leave this area of conjecture and look to 1687, when Dryden's designs, by the shift of politics, had become sufficiently clear to most observers.

It is the rumor from All Souls that merits our first attention. On January 5, 1686/7 died Dr. Thomas James, Warden of that college, and by February 1 the new appointment had been made,—not, however, before the name of Dryden had been suggested.

Mr. Leopold Finch is by the Queen's interest, his brother marrying one of the maids of honour, stept in to be Warden of All Souls College, Dr. James dying soon after you went hence, to the disappointment of Dr. Plot, for

---

\* *The Prose Works of John Dryden*. Ed. Malone (1800), I, ii, 11-12.

whom Walker made all his interest, and of Dryden, for whom others did stickle.<sup>5</sup>

After brief quotation of this sentence from a letter to Robert Harley, Professor Bredvold dismissed it principally by reason of a letter from the poet himself to Etherege in Ratisbon, February 16, in which the former alleged complete political idleness. It was perhaps with undue confidence in Dryden's ingenuousness that Professor Bredvold produced this as evidence. Ratisbon was far across Europe, and in that day even gossip traveled slowly. Happily, however, we have evidence that is more decisive.

Since it is of some pertinence to the biography of Dryden, we may first glance at the various candidates and their supporters. In the front rank with a nomination, even before the death of the old Warden, was the Catholic Master of University College, Obadiah Walker. A letter in the Tanner MSS. remarks:

we fear that our over-the-way friend Mr. Walker will make him a successor, and by all that we can guess Mr. Stapleton of our House is the person for whom he designs to get a Mandate.<sup>6</sup>

The guess appears to have been without warrant; as we have seen, it was Dr. Plot, the well-known antiquarian and papist, who was Walker's ultimate candidate. Elsewhere, we read that other active rivals for the post were Dr. Tindal of All Souls and Dr. Watson, afterwards Bishop of St. David's. The names are of interest as showing the stature of the men with whom Dryden was in competition. "Finch got the start of them." Leopold Finch had everything in his favor except good character. He had been something of a rake in the days of 1681, when breaking windows and committing other misdemeanors was still in favor; his father was a personal friend of Charles II; an Emperor and a King had been his sponsors at the font; his uncle was Lord Chancellor, and he himself an extraordinarily suave politician. It is to Finch that we owe conclusive evidence that Dryden was not only his very definite but perhaps most dangerous rival. Writing for final approbation of his appointment to Archbishop Sancroft, February 1, 1686/7, Finch elaborated as follows upon his disinterested motives in standing for the post:

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm., Portland MSS., III, 397.*

<sup>6</sup> Montague Burrows: *Worthies of All Souls*, London (1874), p. 290. Cf. pp. 287-304.



A little before that very good man, our late Warden dyed, I receiv'd a letter in *Kent* from a great hand at Court, which inform'd me of the danger he was then in, and further assur'd me, that though his successor was not yet named, yet that it was already determin'd, that his Wardenship should be dispos'd of by Mandate. He was pleas'd to press me to attempt the getting of it, affirming, that if I had it not, an actuall Papist would; so that if I had any concern for the well fare of the College and University, he thought I stood obliged to endeavour the keeping out persons so unqualified for the service of either.<sup>7</sup>

Hence it was that he entered into the race and finally was possessed of the mandate, "for which so many great interests had so fiercely contested."<sup>8</sup> His letter continues with an explanation of the various arguments advanced, "as he understood," by the fellows of All Souls for ratifying the King's order. If, instead, they had proceeded to a formal election, a lawyer was likewise to be nominated and both were to be sent up to his grace of Canterbury for approbation of one or the other. At this point Finch makes the significant addition, which seems finally authoritative as coming from the successful candidate:

the King, seeing they had left it in another's power to supersede his Mandate, by legally confirming another man, would be sure to give a new Mandate to a third over the others heads, and that such one would be likely to be of Mr. *Dryden's* sort, since he so lately stood so faire to preside over them.<sup>9</sup>

Beyond that it is all conjecture. Dryden possibly may have been the King's original candidate, but because of the latter's unwillingness to press a catholic against so great an opposition, he allowed the post to go by default to Finch. At least one might so read between the lines.

A single episode of Dryden's career, hitherto lacking a certain degree of pertinancy, is all that is required to complete the story. It is recounted in a letter, of January 27, 1686/7, from the Bishop of Carlyle:

The Warden of All Souls being lately dead he is succeeded by Mr. Finch, son of the Earl of Winchelsea, one of the fellows of that College, and an ingenious young gentleman; who lately meeting with Mr. Dryden in a coffee house in London, publicly before all the company wished him much

<sup>7</sup> (J. Gutch) *Collectanea Curiosa*, Oxford (1781), II, 49. "A Letter from the Hon. L. W. Finch to the Archbishop of Canterbury."

<sup>8</sup> *Ib.* p. 51.

<sup>9</sup> *Ib.* p. 52.

joy of his *new* religion. "Sir," said Dryden, "you are very much mistaken; my religion is the *old* religion." "Nay" replied the other, "what-ever it be in itself I am sure 'tis new to you, for within these 3 days you had no religion at all."<sup>10</sup>

Dryden's answer appears to have lain elsewhere.

By reason then of the authenticity of this report from All Souls, it becomes the more likely that there was a certain degree of truth in the subsequent rumor of his prospective nomination to the Presidency of Magdalen. It bears the likeness of a second push by his friends. There the battle was even more violent, and again Dryden if proposed was deflected from his object sometime between June and August, 1687. He was not, however, through with Magdalen College when finally the appointment was given to Bishop Samuel Parker. Unnoticed in the biographies of Dryden is the fact that he was at one certain point intimately concerned with the political upheaval in that college. A letter of December 31, 1687, from the King to the Bishop of Oxford issues this mandate:

Whereas there are several Fellowships now vacant in our College of St. Mary Magdalen, Our Will and Pleasure is that you forthwith admit our trusty and well-beloved Richard Compton Thomas Fairfax Edward Merideth John Dryden Philip Lewis &c . . .<sup>11</sup>

By diverse accounts this John Dryden was admitted fellow in January, and stricken from the college Buttery Book after the revolution, October 25, 1688. There can be little doubt but that this was the second son of the poet, his nomination definitely a mark of Dryden's active and continuing interest in the colleges. May not his son's appointment have been something even in the nature of a sop, after his recent disappointment?

But as though there were not enough, two further rumors remain to substantiate the general design. The first is without date; the other would seem to indicate Dryden's final move of 1687-8. Vague reference to both appeared in an anonymous satire of 1689, entitled *The Address of John Dryden, Laureat To His Highness the Prince of Orange*. This poem purported to be an *apologia pro vita sua*, spoken by Dryden himself and tracing the innumerable shifts

<sup>10</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm.* Le Fleming MSS., 12th Rept. viii, 202.

<sup>11</sup> The Rev. J. R. Bloxam, *Magdalen College and James II*, Oxford (1886), p. 225. Cf. pp. 228, 231, 232, 265.

he was supposed to have employed in his progress from common-wealth man, to whig, to tory, to catholic, and ultimately to Moham-medan, climax of the time-server :

When the bold *Crescent* lately attack'd the Cross,  
 Resolv'd the Empire of the World t'engross,  
 Had tottering *Vienna's* Walls but fail'd,  
 And *Turkey* over *Christendom* prevail'd,  
 Long e're this I had cross'd the *Dardanello*,  
 And sate the Mighty Mahomet's Hail Fellow,  
 Quitting my duller Hopes, the poor Renown  
 of *Eaton-College*, or a *Dublin-Gown*  
 And commenc'd Graduate of the Great *Divan*,  
 Had reign'd a more Immortal Musselman.<sup>12</sup>

Hence we have the first hint that Dryden, at some period of his career, was perhaps not without hope of becoming provost of Eton College. The suggestion recurred the following year in Tom Brown's satire, *The Late Converts Exposed*. After some passing allusion to the poet's former severity upon the priesthood, Brown remarked :

*But you I find, still continue your old humour, which we are to date from the year of the Hegira [namely from the flight of James], the loss of Eaton, or since Orders were refused you: whatever hangs out either Black or Green Colours, is presently your prize . . .*<sup>13</sup>

And so the matter rests without definite clue as to the year of the Eton adventure or any assurance as to its essential truth. But the significant fact remains, that by the time of the revolution the rumors concerning Dryden and the colleges had become cumulative. Their number indicates a general interest in his movements at what must have been regarded the crisis of his career.

A fourth report added to the other three perhaps seems slightly

<sup>12</sup> P. 5.

<sup>13</sup> *The Late Converts Exposed: Or the Reasons of Mr. Bays' Changing his Religion. Part the Second*, London (1690), The Preface. Brown's difficult allusion to colors may be explained by a speech from *Don Sebastian* (1690), Act IV, p. 99, where referring to the Mohammedan priestly costume it is remarked: "Our *Mufti's* is a Green coat, and the *Christian's* is a black coat: and we must wisely go by the ears, whether green or black shall sweep our spoils." Dryden's own Mufti, then, may have suggested the various Mohammedan sequels to his fortune. Brown clearly had the play in mind.

preposterous. Nevertheless, in view of the events of 1688, it assumes a degree of authenticity. The allusion to a Dublin-Gown, in the anonymous *Address of John Dryden*, raises an interesting, if by itself fruitless, point of conjecture. What exactly was the poet's concern with Ireland? Did he perhaps contemplate toward the end of his career some preferment overseas as a final mode of escape? A partial answer to these questions rests in two manuscript poems recently discovered in the British Museum. In one handwriting and, by their style, apparently the frenzy of a single poet, the first goes under the illuminating title, *On Doctor Dryden coming over to be provost of Trinity Colledge*, the second merely *Another Satyr on the Same*.<sup>14</sup> Unhappily there is little more of biographical interest to be gathered than by the titles. But these satires, if they may be called such, at least serve to verify the place, to cast a curious light into the protestant mind of the revolution, and to supply some distorted criticism of John Dryden, the poet, as his fame had been refracted across the Irish sea.

The first opens with the thread-bare charge of atheism, in his case largely reechoed since the days of huffing Maximin:

Haile Rhyming Atheist may thy passage be  
as boystrous as thy ranting poetry  
may the just god, who doth command the seas  
pickle in briny waves thy wither'd bayes  
whilst the resenting seas conspire thy fall  
and in thy fate serve their great Admirall  
but if the milder god preserve they breath  
doom'd to be lost by a dry hempen death  
at thy approach let raging whirl-winds rise  
and dismall lightning fill the troubl'd Skies,  
such omen shou'd attend a libertine  
then thou mightst brave the gods like Maximin,  
hurle pointed daggers, at the starry throne  
and lowdly tell the trembling gods theire owne  
but with this difference.  
he e're his quarrell with the harmless Skies  
treated the hungry gods with sacrifice  
Thou never wo'dst admitt a deity  
A manly Atheist in thy infancy  
but if the partiall gods doe yet refuse  
to drown, or tempest-toss thy turne coate Muse

---

<sup>14</sup> Addit. MSS. 38, 671, fols. 31-32.

and calmer gales attend thee may it be  
 only to drive thee to some forraigne sea  
 goe with thy Cortez to the Indian Shore  
 there be presented to the emperour  
 the fourth time change thy noe religion there  
 least to thy prince ungratefull thou appeare  
 for shou'd some kindness there to thee be showne  
 It were sin in thee not to adore the Sun  
 When there thou landest th'affrighted blacks will [see]  
 A double monster both by Ship and thee <sup>16</sup>  
 But if whilst wee in vaine against thee strive  
 Saff[e]ly to th'Irish coast thou do'st arrive  
 may brawny Shadwells ne're be wanting here  
 to pull thy sacred lawrells and thy haire,  
 may drubs of Colledge-green afflict thee more  
 then those smart blows thou in Rose-ally bore.

The other diatribe contains little to warrant printing. Atheism, impiety, apostasy are the terms it abounds in:

keen pointed verse shall stab the learn[e]d sott  
 give him a grave and give him hell to boot.

Conceding the erudition of Dryden and his qualification, at least upon that score, for the chair of provost, the poem raises a query concerning his new title of Doctor. Perhaps there may here be some vague reminiscence of the report already alluded to that:

A Mandate is said to be gone down to Oxford for Mr. Dryden to go out Doctor of Divinity, and also that he will be made President of Magdalen College.<sup>16</sup>

The degree would not have been inconsistently bestowed upon the author of *The Hind and the Panther* or those various controversial tracts in answer to Stillingfleet; nor, leaving aside the claims of poetry and religion, was any great injury done to his assumed designs by their composition during 1686-7. But to revert to Dublin—Granted the inevitable outcry of a few malcontents, it nevertheless seems altogether likely that Dryden might there have been favored with a better reception than at the various other colleges with which rumor connected his name, since Trinity for awhile was a notorious hot-bed of Jacobitism.<sup>17</sup> He appears, how-

<sup>16</sup> For these allusions, cf. Act I, sc. ii of *The Indian Emperour* (1667).

<sup>16</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Downshire, 1, i, 251.

<sup>17</sup> W. M. Dixon, *Trinity College, Dublin* (1902), p. 288.

ever, not to have been a belligerent, and may well have withdrawn his candidacy out of weariness. His misadventures in college politics were finished.

Once only, and that five years after these events, does Dryden so much as allude to his disappointment. At that time, when philosophy had to some extent assuaged his wounded feelings, he ventured a reference that, in the light of what has been discovered, seems to round out a period. Thus in 1674 at Oxford he had

wish'd, this happy seat  
Might prove his fading Muse's last retreat;

and, now stripped of his ambition, in 1693 he undertook to console himself:

Why am I grown old, in seeking so barren a reward as fame? The same parts and application which have made me a poet *might have raised me to any honours of the gown, which are often given to men of as little learning and less honesty than myself.* No Government has ever been, or ever can be, wherein timeservers and blockheads will not be uppermost . . . I am not ashamed to be little, when I see them so infamously great; neither do I know why the name of poet should be dishonourable to me, if I am truly one, as I hope I am; for I will never do anything that shall dishonour it.<sup>18</sup>

ROSWELL G. HAM

*Yale University*

---

### A LOST PLAY BY D'URFEY

That Thomas D'Urfey, the most prolific dramatist of the Restoration period, wrote a play (now lost) called *A Wife for Any Man*, was first noticed, I believe, by W. Barclay Squire, in his article on Jeremiah Clarke in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Squire was a scholar of great acumen, but his chief concern was with old English music. For this reason his work has sometimes been overlooked by purely literary investigators. In the case of *A Wife for Any Man*, for instance, his remarks have failed to bear fruit, and the name of the play remains unfamiliar to bibliographers and students of the Restoration drama. Squire believed that *A Wife for Any Man* was produced between 1704 and 1707, when Clarke died,

<sup>18</sup> *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. Ker II, 1-2. Quoted from the "Dedication of Examen Poeticum." The italics are mine.

and that Clarke's incidental music <sup>1</sup> is the only record of it. I am now able to date the play more accurately, and to supply further information about it.

In the first place, Squire's dates are probably a decade too late, because two songs from the play were printed as early as 1699. In *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills to Purge Melancholy* (1699),<sup>2</sup> appears for the first time a song beginning "De'll take the war that hurried Willy from me," which later acquired considerable popularity. This song is ascribed to D'Urfey in an eighteenth-century single-sheet edition,<sup>3</sup> the title of which reads: "*A Song in a Wife for any Man the words by Mr Tho D'urfey Set to Musick by Mr Charles Powell Sung by Mrs Cross and exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross.*" The tune here ascribed to Powell is the same as the anonymous tune in *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills to Purge Melancholy*, but does not correspond to any of Clarke's trebles in Addit. MS. 35043. Powell's tune is also used in *The Cobbler's Opera* (1729), air I, *The Lover's Opera* (1729), air IX, and *The Beggar's Wedding* (1729), air XIII.

Another song from the play appears as follows in *Mercurius Musicus* (September-December, 1699):<sup>4</sup>

*A Song, Sung by Mrs. Cross in the Play call'd, A  
Wife for any Man*

Oh all ye gods of Holy Truth,  
that saw the Virtues of my Yonth [*sic*]  
save a poor helpless wretched Maid,  
by Love's deceitful Arts betray'd;  
save, save a Poor helpless slave  
a poor helpless wrteched Maid,  
by Love's deceitful Arts betray'd.

Of these two songs, the first, "De'll take the war that hurried Willy from me," must have been written before the Peace of Ryswick in 1697, since it contains allusions to William III's campaigns on the continent. Now *A Wife for Any Man* is not men-

<sup>1</sup> The best manuscript seems to be the one in the library of the Sacred Harmonic Society (*Catalogue of the Library of the Sacred Harmonic Society*, 1872, No. 1978). There is another in the British Museum (Addit. MS. 35043, ff. 71-72), consisting of the overture and eight airs, and headed "Mr Clarkes 1st Trebles in ye Farce Called A Wife for Any Man."

<sup>2</sup> I, 294-295.

<sup>3</sup> British Museum: G. 304(49).

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 193-195.

tioned in the catalogue of D'Urfey's plays printed with the third part of *The Comical History of Don Quixote*, which was published in December, 1695.<sup>5</sup> Hence it was probably written between that date and the Peace of Ryswick in September, 1697. The allusions in the titles of the two songs to Mrs. Cross, a popular young singer of the period, imply that the play was actually produced.

Some years later, on June 7, 1714, *The Richmond Heiress* was performed for D'Urfey's benefit at the Drury Lane Theatre. On this occasion, according to *The Daily Courant*,<sup>6</sup> D'Urfey spoke "a new Oration by way of Prologue . . . part of it design'd for a New Comedy of his, call'd A Wife worth a Kingdom." Perhaps this was the former play refurbished by D'Urfey in an effort to have it acted again and published.

University of Delaware

CYRUS L. DAY

#### A POSSIBLE ORIGIN OF CONGREVE'S SAILOR BEN

Mr. Crane Taylor's statement that Ben in Congreve's *Love for Love* "enjoys the distinction of being the first complete and realistic portrayal of a sailor in English literature"<sup>1</sup> does not convey the whole truth so accurately as does Mr. Montague Summers's assertion that "There were scores of sailors, right from the time of the Mystery Plays, but Congreve gives us a more elaborate and closely studied picture of the honest tarpaulin than is found heretofore."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Summers points out that in Thomas D'Urfey's *Sir Barnaby Whigg* (1681) there appears the character of Porpuss, "A blunt Tarpawlin Captain, and one that uses his Sea-phrases and terms upon all occasions," and that in the same author's *The Marriage-Hater Match'd* (1691-2) there is the character of Darewell, "An honest blunt Sea Captain." Mr. Summers suggests the possibility of Congreve's taking a hint from the inferior dramatist, when he created Sailor Ben.

Another "blunt Sea-Captain" of Restoration drama is Edward

<sup>5</sup> See Squire, "Purcell's Dramatic Music," *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 1904, v, 518.

<sup>6</sup> No. 3937, June 7, 1714. The oration is printed in *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills to Purge Melancholy*, 1719, I, 337-339.

<sup>1</sup> William Congreve, p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> *The Complete Works of William Congreve*, II, 81.



Ravenscroft's Durzo. Ravenscroft first introduces Durzo, as comic relief, in his tragi-comedy, *King Edgar and Alfreda* (1677), and later incorporates him into his *Canterbury Guests* (1694). In *The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama*, p. 164, Mr. H. F. Watson points out a slight resemblance between Durzo and Captain Porpuss. Since Mr. Watson appears to have met with Durzo only in *The Canterbury Guests* and seems to have no knowledge of his previous existence in *King Edgar and Alfreda*, he incorrectly implies that Ravenscroft borrowed from D'Urfey.<sup>3</sup>

Although, as Mr. Summers suggests, D'Urfey may have supplied Congreve with the hint for Sailor Ben, it appears to me more likely that Congreve's character was suggested by Durzo. As *The Canterbury Guests* was produced at the Theatre Royal less than a year before *Love for Love* was first performed at Lincoln's Inn Fields, Congreve had the opportunity of observing Ravenscroft's character while his play was taking shape in his mind. Ben is certainly a more finished product than Durzo, but he is the same type of bluff, seafaring man who speaks in nautical terms. Moreover, a remark of his to Mrs. Frail (*Love for Love*, III, iii), unquestionably echoes one of Durzo's (*Canterbury Guests*, II, ix, p. 23). Ben says: "Mess, you're a tight vessel! and well rigged, an you were but as well manned." Durzo exclaims: "Three very snug Frigats, well Rigg'd; 'twere pity too but they were as well Man'd."

Miss Kathleen Lynch has already suggested that in writing *The Way of the World* and in composing the characters of Mirabell and Millamant, Congreve may have recalled certain scenes and characters in *The Canterbury Guests* (scenes transposed by Ravenscroft from his *Careless Lovers*).<sup>4</sup> It seems quite possible that Ravenscroft, not only with his *Careless* and *Hillaria*, but also with his Durzo, may have supplied some of the seeds from which grew the great comic characters of Mirabell, Millamant, and Sailor Ben.

The Johns Hopkins University

EDWARD T. NORRIS

<sup>3</sup> Unfamiliarity with Ravenscroft's *The Careless Lovers* (1673), scenes from which the author also incorporated into *The Canterbury Guests*, has caused Mr. Watson to make similar mistakes, by implying that Ravenscroft has borrowed speeches from Mrs. Behn's *The Rover* (1677); whereas, if any indebtedness exists, it is Mrs. Behn and not Ravenscroft who is the borrower. See *The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama*, pp. 144-6.

<sup>4</sup> *The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy*, pp. 162, 202, 203.

## REVIEWS

*Die Philosophie der Aufklärung.* Von ERNST CASSIRER. Tübingen :  
J. C. B. Mohr, 1932. xviii, 491 pages. M. 14.50.

The historians of philosophy always have neglected the period of Enlightenment because of the absence of great systems comparable to those of the seventeenth and the later eighteenth century. The most inclusive systematizer, Christian Wolff, is not original enough to be truly representative and, in his popularizing tendency often trivial enough to discredit the entire thinking of the period. Thus, the historian of eighteenth century literature had to rely mostly on the inadequate expressions of Enlightenment thought in literature and, worse, on the reaction against it in works of a later period. Even Korff who in his *Geist der Goethezeit* tries to be more just to Enlightenment, treats it too much as an antithesis to do full justice to its historical significance. This antithetic presentation also conveys too static and uniform an impression of rationalistic thinking, which as such is contradictory to the very essence of Enlightenment. Its accomplishment and function in the history of ideas can only be adequately expressed in the process of growing, since a sober and carefully progressing induction is as characteristic for the general structure of this mind as its much decried, but rarely well-defined rationalism. Reason and rationalism, vague slogans as such, assume a real meaning only when the function of reason is demonstrated for the different fields of Enlightenment thinking. This is the task of Cassirer's treatise, which was written as part of the *Grundriss der philosophischen Wissenschaften*. Reason is here exhibited as a leading principle of research, as the basic assumption that everything is subject to rational laws; but unlike in seventeenth-century philosophy these laws are not pre-established or anticipated by reason; on the contrary, they are induced from patiently accumulated facts. This gradual approach to the principles is here exposed as the principle underlying the investigations in science, psychology, epistemology, history, social sciences, and esthetics. Instead of a criticism of the results of Enlightenment thinking, the author shows how the attempt to reveal the rational principle in the world order on the one hand fulfilled an important heuristic function, but on the other led to a levelled conception of existence and subsequently brought about the change from the analytical and causal modes of thinking to an organic and integral conception especially with regard to individuality, artistic creation, and historical events. Mathematical interpretation of nature gave way to a descriptive attitude preparing the esthetic attitude of the classical period. In the field of psychology

and epistemology, the impressions are related to the function of the instinct, whereby the active energy of the perceiving subject is first introduced. Through the secularization of the content matter, faith and opining in religion are replaced in their importance and value by the moral deed, and as a consequence of this, intolerance becomes unreasonable and immoral. In the field of esthetics, a similar change of viewpoint leads from the principle of beauty to the recognition of the dynamic category of the sublime. Enlightenment philosophy is thus described and characterized as a movement from the great deductive systems of the seventeenth century to the more organic systems of the idealistic period.

In my opinion, this presentation of the philosophy of the Enlightenment period is indispensable for a literary historian of the eighteenth century, because it provides a relatively large space for the study of esthetic ideas in correlation to other fields of thinking, and because it convincingly disposes of the static and depreciative conception of Enlightenment. For the benefit of these historians, the author might have added a brief summary of the main problems and their typical treatment and development.

F. W. KAUFMANN

*Smith College*

---

*Deutsche Literatur. Sammlung literarischer Kunst- und Kulturdenkmäler in Entwicklungsreihen. Reihe: Deutsche Selbstzeugnisse* herausgegeben von MARIANNE BEYER-FRÖHLICH. Band 5: *Aus dem Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation*. Leipzig: Philipp Reclam jun., 1932. Cloth, M. 9.

In a previous issue we reported on the introductory volume and the autobiographies of the period of the Thirty Years' War. The fifth volume does not introduce any of the representative characters of the Reformation movement itself—they are to be presented in the fourth volume; most of the material in this volume is taken from the writings of men who were somehow or other drawn into the turmoil of the counter-reformation.

Some of the passages touch a somewhat familiar chord as Johannes Keszler's report on his first meeting with Martin Luther, or Theophrastus Paracelsus' medical writings with their highly personal and ethical note, and Geizkofer's description of the terrors he experienced in Paris during the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's.

The selections are well balanced as far as the differences in religious opinion are concerned, there are representatives of the old faith and adherents of the Protestant creed, and—more interesting and characteristic for the inner uncertainty of this time—those who do not know what to believe: a Roman Catholic fighting against

the monks, and a Jew who successively becomes a Catholic priest and a minister of the Reformed Church.

The political unrest is reflected in the autobiography of Schertlin von Burtenbach, the mercenary general, who in a strange way combines religious faith and adventure, greed and love for his home. Hans Ulrich Krafft's account of his life as a Turkish debt prisoner reflects the capitalistic crisis in the second half of the 16th century. The unnational attitude of German princes during the Thirty Years' War is foreshadowed in the unworthy endeavor to obtain the order of the Garter at the English court by an emissary of the Duke of Württemberg; the feeble Churchism of the Hapsburgians is indirectly portrayed in the report on Ferdinand II's pilgrimage-like journey to Rome. The selections which in some parts read more like a chronicle than an autobiography, provide as a whole a vivid picture of the discord and the growing lack of aim and leadership which preceded the Thirty Years' War.

F. W. KAUFMANN

Smith College

---

*Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart.* Von Prof. Dr. FRIEDRICH VOGT und Prof. Dr. MAX KOCH. Fünfte Auflage, neubearbeitet und erweitert von Dr. Willi Koch. Erster Band. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1934.

Die Literaturgeschichte, die im Jahre 1897 zum erstenmal erschien, wird in fünfter Auflage "völlig neubearbeitet und neuausgestattet" herausgegeben von Dr. Willi Koch. Soweit liegt von den geplanten drei Bänden der erste vor, der von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des Barock reicht und im Texte Friedrich Vogts nur geringfügige Änderungen erfahren hat. Dagegen sind die drei Kapitel, die Literatur des Barock betreffend, völlig umgearbeitet. Der Herausgeber mußte sich dabei, der Anlage des Werkes entsprechend, Beschränkungen auferlegen, da es sich um eine gemeinverständliche Darstellung handelt. Wenn er diese allerdings dahin charakterisiert, daß er auf geistesgeschichtliche Problemstellungen habe verzichten müssen, so klingt das beinahe boshaft, ist aber wohl kaum so gemeint. Jedenfalls ist entgegen der heutigen Tendenz der Ueberwertung des Barock Kochs eigne Behandlung der Periode reichlich kühl und trocken. Die außerordentlichen formalen Eroberungen eines Weckherlin, Fleming und Stieler werden nicht genügend anerkannt und ihr Hinausgehen über die Tradition, in dem sich ihre kraftvolle Eigenart kundtut, kaum angedeutet. Scheffler wird gegen Spee nicht hinreichend abgesetzt. Obwohl die beiden sich in ihren geistlichen Liedern berühren, fehlt dem

Epigrammatiker und Verdichter die eigentliche lyrische Ader und die Freude an der sinnlichen Erscheinung.

Hier und da machen die Inhaltsangaben den Eindruck, als ob sie flüchtigem Lesen entsprängen. So ist die Handlung der *Geliebten Dornrose* ungenügend charakterisiert mit den Worten: "ein Bauernbursch gewinnt das durch den Dienst in der Stadt verwöhnte Mädchen erst nach langen Verwicklungen." Der Bauer heißt übrigens Klotzmann und nicht Kletzmann, sowie in Zieglers *Banise* des Prinzen Name nicht Balakia sondern Balacin ist. Hoffentlich sind der zweite und dritte Band vom selben Verfasser etwas wärmer gehalten.

Dankenswert indessen ist die gute Bibliographie, die bis auf die neusten Erscheinungen fortgeführt ist und alles Wichtige zusammenträgt, und in der ich bei Stichproben eigentlich nur Hübshers Aufsatz über *Barock als Gestaltung antithetischen Lebensgefühls* (Euphorion 24) vermißt habe.

Die Leistung des Verlages, der diesen reich und gut illustrierten Band von 427 Seiten mit vielen farbigen eingelebten Reproduktionen in blaues Leinen sehr gut gebunden für Mk. 9.50 liefert, ist durchaus anzuerkennen.

ERNST FEISE

*Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal: Being an Account of the Connections between the British Isles and the Jansenists of France and Holland.* By RUTH CLARK. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Pp. xx + 360. \$4.75.

Miss C. has produced a work of genuine research based largely on primary documents discovered in the archives and libraries of England, Holland and France. The excuse, if excuse is needed, for this account of the connections between the British Isles and the Jansenists of France and Holland is expressed, too modestly, in her preface: ". . . this study does not and cannot claim to be an exhaustive history of Jansenism and Great Britain, but it does hope to have accomplished some honest spadework which may help to lay the foundation for some larger treatise, undertaken, possibly, by a theologian." And it is not of course beyond the realm of possibility that this study may serve some day as an important chapter in the hagiography of the reunited Church.

The form of presentation of the material should delight the scholarly mind. An adequate preface, a chronology, the "Five Propositions" and the "Formulary of Alexander VII" precede the text; at the end appear two appended documents, a bibliography of seventeenth and eighteenth century books connecting Jansenism and Port Royal with the British Isles, a further bibliography of authorities in three sections, manuscripts, contemporary printed

documents and modern works, and best of all a fifty-six page index, a most useful and necessary feature in a book that will be much used for reference.

The attractiveness of the volume has been overstressed rather than overlooked. The type is pleasing and the errors rare and self-correcting (faulty typesetting in the note on page 291). Seven plates adorn the pages. After subjection to the rules of American printers it is a pleasure to see "Mr" "Mrs" "Mme" "Dr" etc., appearing without the vicious period. The main title is, however, definitely misleading as well as contradictory to the descriptive subtitle. Strangers to Port Royal are discussed much more than sojourners at Port Royal. After a chapter dealing with early English sympathizers with the doctrines of Jansenius at Louvain and in England, there follow four chapters concerning British subjects "In and About Port Royal" and individuals who, living abroad, came under the influence of Port Royal and the Jansenists. The eighteenth and final chapter presents Mrs. Schimmelpenninck's sentimental pilgrimage to Port Royal des Champs in 1814. The twelve intervening chapters discuss mainly Jansenist influences and theological disputes and intrigues centering around the Sorbonne, the Papal Court at Rome and religious groups in Holland and the British Isles. Thus in the work as a whole, Port Royal is the spiritual background rather than the physical setting as suggested by the title.

At times Miss C. has been forced to deal with the tortuous and issueless bypaths of theological wrangling, "sentiers," according to Sainte-Beuve, "que le choc seul gâte et ravage, qu'il faut se hâter d'abandonner dès que la dispute nous y suit; car cela devient, au bout de dix pas, un sentier inextricable de ronces." Sainte-Beuve's criticism is directed here against the disputants and not the historians. Miss C., as scientific historian, has handled the matter with commendable moderation and impartiality. As for the style, a rather awkward use of connectives contrasts with apparent efforts to obtain literary grace. But the reviewer must confess that he would have abstained from cavil had he not been led by the attractiveness and title of the volume to expect vacation reading.

*Yale University*

NORMAN L. TORREY

---

*English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750.* By RICHMOND P. BOND.  
(Harvard Studies in English, vi.) Cambridge: Harvard  
University Press, 1932. Pp. xi + 483. \$3.50.

Outstanding in Mr. Bond's valuable investigation are his set of definitions for the critic of comic poetry and his register of burlesque verse. Lack of discriminating definition and adequate

bibliography have long confused and hampered discussion of English burlesque poetry. Each critic has therefore molded critical terms to suit his own thesis, and left bibliography chiefly to the meager bit accompanying Charles Whibley's essay in *CHEL*, ix, 549-552. This clear, exhaustive study has perhaps resolved the double riddle.

A vocabulary for the critic of burlesque verse, according to Mr. Bond, comprises five basic words: *burlesque*, *travesty*, *parody*, *mock-heroic*, and *Hudibrastic*. *Burlesque* ("incongruous imitation"), the generic term, is thus divided: *low burlesque* (subject above style), consisting of *travesty* as in *Scarronides*, and *Hudibrastic*; *high burlesque* (style above subject), consisting of *parody* as in *The Splendid Shilling*, and *mock-poem* as in *The Rape of the Lock*. The ramifications are best left to Mr. Bond's masterly first chapter. Those who define the humorous according to Meredith may question whether "the essence of humor lies in incongruity"; but the question is obviously open. These definitions, fortified by judicious distillation of eighteenth-century and present-day comment, permit Mr. Bond to classify and analyze critically a large body of burlesque verse. In Part I the thesis emerges that during this period travesty dwindled, parody practised its scales, and mock-poem brought "the jester Wit . . . nearer the throne of Poetry" than ever again.

The annotated register of Part II chronologically arranges the two hundred and eleven burlesque poems which Mr. Bond has found for his period, and provides them with serial numbers for easy reference. This body of verse adequately documents and substantiates the thesis already set forth. The index is full and exact. Only by the patient toil of a scholarly mind are such lists compiled, and future critics of English comic poetry owe Mr. Bond thanks no less for this excellent register than for his enlightening definitions.

About a study as satisfying as this, graced with such excellent critical discussion as appears in Chapters II, VII, VIII, and perhaps best of all Chapter III (on *The Rape of the Lock*), one hesitates to make suggestions. But surely, in discussing *The Dunciad*, Mr. Bond as a zealous collector has overstressed the importance of the *-iad* tribe to his thesis. He might have profited by the sage advice offered (*PQ.*, ix, 171) when his article on the "Progeny of *The Dunciad*" appeared. His footnote on Spence's unpublished *Charliad* (p. 166) should have included a reference to Mr. Austin Wright's researches (*Harvard Univ. . . . Summaries of Theses . . . 1931*, pp. 254-256; *PMLA.*, XLVII, 554-558). As to the "N. O." who translated the *Lutrin* in 1682, and whose identity has baffled Mr. Bond (p. 201), it should be recorded that Abraham Woodhead wrote frequently under that pseudonym. The adjective *neat* has too often worked overtime for Mr. Bond. Fur-

thermore, an unfortunate omniscience and lack of modesty permeate his pronouncements, particularly in the footnotes.

But such matters are trivial enough. To a distinguished series a famous press has added a notable study.

BRICE HARRIS

*Cornell University*

---

*The Christian Hero.* By RICHARD STEELE, Edited with an Introduction and a Bibliography. By RAE BLANCHARD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. xxix + 101. \$2.00.

Everybody knows Steele's *Christian Hero* by name, and has read, I suppose, his amusing account of how he came to write it and what its effects were; but probably more than a few have not yet read the 100-page pamphlet itself. The first three chapters recount the careers of Caesar, Cato, Brutus, and Cassius, of Jesus, and of St. Paul, Chap. iv descends "from the bright incentives of their actions to consider lower life, and talk of motives which are common to all men." Steele "will venture to assert that the two great springs of human action are Fame and Conscience." The energizing powers are our passions, and "the predominant passion gives a tincture to all our cares and pleasures"; and Steele is sure that benevolence is innate—at least in some persons; but he knows, too, that self-seeking interest sits close beside it. Interest in the booklet for us is in catching glimpses of the generation's stream of ideas flowing through the mind of Steele. After Harvey's discovery, psychology shifted its basis from humors to passions; and Steele was in that current which, from Roscommon (1684) to Pope (1730-1740), accepted the idea of the Ruling Passion. Like John Dunton, who may be taken to represent mediocrity in his time, he shared the common eagerness for books and sermons of "practical divinity." The ruling passion of the generation was to discover standards of measurements, or rules; it yearned to understand the workings of life, and longed to find the rules for living life successfully, a longing which was to contribute much to the development of the essay (including the periodical essay), the comedy filled with maxims and apothegms designated "sentiments," and the novel of average life.

Miss Blanchard has reprinted with care the *Christian Hero* from the third edition (1710), and placed in footnotes significant variant readings of the first and second editions (both of 1701). Her 20-page introduction is interesting for its analyses and history. The bibliography accounts for twenty-two editions from 1701 to 1820, with a census, pleasing to this reviewer, of course, since it



shows 16 of the 22 editions present in the Library of the University of Texas. None of the few slips from accuracy that I have noticed is worthy of individual mention. The reader may wish to note in the margin of his copy that the couplet quoted on p. 65 is lines 38-39 of the Earl of Rochester's "A Letter from Artemisa." The Oxford University Press has, as usual, made a book pleasant to hold and to read.

R. H. GRIFFITH

*The University of Texas*

---

*The Works of William Burnaby.* Edited by F. E. BUDD. London: Eric Partridge at the Scholartis Press, 1931. Pp. 469. 42 s.

Though his name appears correctly on his stone in Westminster Abbey, Burnaby was forgotten so soon after his early death in 1706 that Whincop, forty years later, calls him *Charles*, an error which has been repeated ever since. Mr. Budd demonstrates beyond question the identity of the playwright with the William Burnaby mentioned by Anthony à Wood as joint author of a translation of the *Satyricon* of Petronius, recently reprinted. The biographical sketch is based on the editor's own spade-work. A Londoner born, a commoner at Merton, and afterwards one of the literary loafers of the Middle Temple, Burnaby wrote a little, engaged in furious litigation with his relatives, scraped along on a slender annuity, and made almost a profession of his association with the wits who vainly tried to project Restoration London into the eighteenth century. His name was linked with a number of great names, including Congreve's and Wycherley's.

His affiliations are indeed only too clearly reflected in his plays. The world was changing around him, and the drama was changing with it; yet Burnaby persisted in playing over the old themes of the amoral comedy of manners. Mr. Budd sees him as a quasi-heroic figure, a little Ajax defying Collier's lightning; and possibly his decision to sink with Congreve rather than survive with Cibber had its gallant side. Yet Burnaby seems a little obtuse in his devotion to a genre which, as Mr. Budd acknowledges, was already archaic, and for which he appears to have had no special talent. Doubtless we all prefer Wycherley to Steele; but the good plays are more apt to be in tune with their times than not: no one will ever write a better comedy (of that kind) than *The Country Wife*; and Burnaby might have done better to recognize that fact and try his hand at something different.

While, as Mr. Summers has remarked (*TLS.*, August 6, 1931), Burnaby's plays were previously not exactly unknown to the learned world, his first editor's enthusiasm for his author is par-

donable. It echoes Professor Nicoll's, which the present writer has never been able to share. These advocates are certainly in excellent company; but does Burnaby really deserve an equal place with Farquhar? Is it not true that everything he had to offer had been done better than was in him to do it, before he began writing at all? Farquhar, on the contrary, had something new to say; a consideration more important than any amount of mere structural deftness, which many an excellent comedy of manners has been able to dispense with altogether. As for style, Burnaby is very labored; he quite lacks rhythm, imagination, and the airy wit of the Restoration masters. He is a kind of Witwoud, painfully composing, one may term it, the *mot* mathematical; for his wit finds its chief expression in comparisons, and these are not figures of speech but the most literal and heavy-handed of plain equations. In such remarks as the following we have the top of his form:

The women that talk of their honor, like the men that talk of their courage, are the people that least value it. . . . To fall in love with a woman because she has a coronet is as unpardonable as to converse with a fop because he has a fine snuffbox. . . . The world is like a ship where the inferior wretches guide the vessel, order the sails, and handle the dirty ropes, while gentlemen are the passengers that have no business but only to look on.

With far more warrant than Millamant we exclaim, "Truce with your similitudes!"

Mr. Budd's editing is careful: his introduction, loaded as it is with documentary evidence, he keeps amusing; his notes are informing and his texts accurate. A hasty collation of a considerable portion of his text of *The Lady's Visiting-Day* with a copy of the Quarto of 1701 revealed but one error: under *Dramatis Personae* (p. 198) the name of the actress Mrs. Martin should be attached to the character, not of Lady Drawle, but of Lady Sobmuch. The publisher, however, deserves a scolding for not supplying running heads to the pages.

Besides the plays, the editor includes four short poems, four epilogues, and a critical essay on the rules for comedy and tragedy, omitting only *The Satyr*. The essay contains a provocative statement, to which Mr. Budd makes no allusion. "I say the less [about comedy]," the writer declares, "because I never bestow'd much Thought upon that sort of Poem, my Taste, Genius, and Inclinations leading me to Tragedy"—a curious remark (whatever the date of the essay) for the author of four comedies, and no tragedies at all. Since, though it seems likely that Burnaby is the "W. B." who signs the essay, Mr. Budd is not able to offer conclusive evidence, two alternatives seem possible: either the Burnaby canon should be purged of this item, or we must grant that he was after all a pretty shrewd judge of his own capacity.

But disagreement with the editor's critical estimates must not

be allowed to obscure the really useful aspects of his work; for these plays have hitherto been available only in the original quartos. More reprinting of the minor dramatists of the Restoration and early eighteenth century is among the prime desiderata. Mr. Budd is heartily to be congratulated on his contribution.

HAZELTON SPENCER

---

*Emerson Today.* By BLISS PERRY. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1931. Pp. 141. \$2.00.

Professor Perry writes in that genteel tradition which for several decades has been at once among the chiefest ornaments and the heaviest liabilities of New England letters. How refreshing, in this raucous era, this age of advertisement and salesmanship, to find a chapter on the granite side of Emerson winding up with a tribute to his quality as a gentleman. Yet what a pity that these lectures, originally delivered at Princeton, should be still withheld from the arena of more widely public controversy. For here is some of the best writing on Emerson in all the vast "literature" of the subject. And the Philistines, though with an exquisite grace and a charming humor, are laid so very low that one must lament, considering how in every hundred readers of the superficial strictures of Mr. Adams and Professor Michaud scarcely one is likely to see the pages of Mr. Perry, who writes, in the first place, out of a scholar's knowledge of the man and his works, and, in the second, with complete understanding of the New England temper that produced him.

Indeed, this little book cuts away the ground from under, not only Mr. James Truslow Adams's extraordinarily ill-informed *Atlantic* paper, but also a great deal of his writing since he laid what once appeared to be a solid foundation for a great career, in his original studies of early New England.

In the first place, the whole of our national inexperience, illustrated by the personal inexperience of Ralph Waldo Emerson, is a myth. His ancestors migrated to America three hundred years ago. They were competent Englishmen, with the experiences of many centuries of civilization behind them. They brought with them long-tested institutions, and they had the resourcefulness to frame new institutions as these were needed. To imagine John Smith and John Winthrop and William Bradford as novices in human society is amusing. Neither were Franklin and Washington and Jefferson precisely babes in the woods. Mr. James Truslow Adams's admirable volumes on New England history reveal that an unwordly idealism was by no means the only stock-in-trade of the colonists. The legend of "a pure America" before 1830 was exploded by Henry Adams in his monumental *History of the United States in Jefferson's Administration*. The era in which Emerson grew to manhood,—the period of Jackson and John Quincy Adams and Clay and Van Buren,—while simple

enough compared with ours in its economics and its manners, was far from being a simple-minded epoch. It was a turbulent, caustic, questioning, many-sided period. "Men were born," it was said, "with knives in their brains." To say that Emerson never suffered is to be strangely ignorant of his biography; to rebut the charge that America never suffered one has only to look at the face of Lincoln. More than half of the able-bodied men of Vermont volunteered for the Civil War. Virginia made an even heavier sacrifice. . . . Emerson's optimism is the optimism that would if possible transcend evil rather than merely deny its existence; it is an endeavor to find "some soul of goodness in things evil, would men observingly distil it out."

"I will not obey it, by God!" It was a federal law of which Emerson was speaking. Despite such spectacles as a book-censored Boston, a *Strange Interlude* moved down (of all places) to Quincy, or a book-buying public that makes a best-seller out of Mr. Robinson, listens gravely to lectures by the author of "The Waste Land," but could only gasp when Mr. Masters in last July's *Mercury* called Lindsay's best work "the largest body of inspired lyricism which any American has contributed to literature," "I will not, by God," remains part of the heritage of the Massachusetts stock—a fact obscured for some recent writers on Emerson partly by the phenomena just mentioned, and partly by the prevailing misunderstanding, not so much of what our Puritan forefathers were trying to do, as of who they were.

Mr. Perry's scope and objective are accurately suggested by the title of his book. It is not merely another descriptive treatise. Ultimately, as its influence seeps out through the university teachers who read it, it should do much to further a less impeded reception of Emerson as a force in contemporary culture.

HAZELTON SPENCER

---

*The Life of Joseph Wright.* By ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Vol. I, pp. xii + 348; vol. II, pp. 349-710. \$7.50.

The biography of the late Professor Wright which his wife has given us must be judged, not as a work of art but as a contribution to the history of linguistic scholarship in England. So judged, it is a book of some importance. Its author, herself an Anglicist of parts, has of course had the best of opportunities to learn whereof she speaks, and her work will long stand, I think, as a valuable source of information about a significant period in the intellectual life of man. But the *Life* has other values too. As a human document it is revealing and moving. Mrs. Wright, though not a literary artist, has nevertheless succeeded in sweeping one reader, at least, off his feet, and surely there will be few to read without sharing the author's simple pride and joy and sorrow. The

vitality of the *Life*, in sum, grows out of the fact that it is a labor of love. As such, it has the defects of its qualities, needless to say. The author takes pains to be accurate, and she has printed masses of original documents of all descriptions, but a critical attitude toward her subject, and toward her vast collections of "source-material," is almost wholly wanting. The *Life* is therefore much longer than it need have been, and many a would-be reader, I fear, will be frightened off. And yet one may doubt whether Mrs. Wright could have got her effect had she tried to be critical. As it stands, the work is rugged but heroic. It makes Wright live. And what more can we ask for?

KEMP MALONE

---

*The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry.* With Introductory Chapters by R. W. CHAMBERS, MAX FÖRSTER and ROBIN FLOWER. Printed and published for the Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral by Percy Lund, Humphries & Co., Ltd. Pp. 94 + plates 264. London, 1933. Ten guineas.

A facsimile edition of the *Exeter Book* has for many years been a crying need, but it is perhaps as well that the preparation of such an edition was so long delayed, for earlier philological scholarship, competent and devoted though it undoubtedly was, could not command the technical facilities now available to the editor, nor had paleography, even in the first two decades of the present century, attained its present standards of precision in classifying and dating the records of the early Middle Ages. The present edition has profited in particular by the use of ultra-violet rays, in the capable hands of Professor E. N. da C. Andrade (among others); apparatus of this sort, we may hope, will soon be used to help us in reading the damaged folios of other OE. codices as well, not yet submitted to the ultra-violet process.

The introductory chapters of the volume are seven in number. Mr. Chambers wrote two: a general account of the MS. and its donor, and a history of "modern study of the poetry of the *Exeter Book*." Mr. Förster wrote three: (1) an account of "the donations of Leofric to Exeter"; (2) a discussion of "the preliminary matter of the *Exeter Book*"; and (3) a description of the MS. Mr. Flower wrote one: on "the script of the *Exeter Book*." Mr. Chambers and Mr. Flower together contributed a chapter on the "transcription of the damaged passages in the *Exeter Book*." All these introductory chapters stand on a very high level of philological scholarship, as the names of their authors would indicate. Moreover, the collotype photography has been done so beautifully that another facsimile edition of the MS. will hardly be needed

within any foreseeable time. In short, we have here a volume which it would be hard for a reviewer to praise too highly. The Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral have won the gratitude of all Saxonists by their generosity in giving to the world so noble a book, and by their wisdom in entrusting to such competent hands the task of its preparation. The facsimile edition which they have published will always be reckoned indispensable in any anglistic library worthy of the name, and among medievalists generally the volume will be greeted with a quiet but deep satisfaction that one of the few great old manuscripts of the tenth century has now been reproduced in a form worthy of its distinction.

KEMP MALONE

---

*The Growth of Literature.* By H. M. and N. K. CHADWICK: Vol. I, *The Ancient Literatures of Europe*. Cambridge (Macmillan), 1932. Pp. xx + 672.

In the volume under review Mr. and Mrs. Chadwick give us the first instalment of a monumental survey of oral tradition. The survey as a whole is concerned with such literary material as may be reckoned of oral rather than written composition (even though known to us in written form only). The authors plan to exclude all works properly described as writings, i. e. composed in periods when it was usual to make literary records. They deal, therefore, with speakings alone (to coin a badly needed term). Their first volume takes up the speakings of Greek, Germanic and Celtic origin; their second will consider the Russian and Yugoslavic speakings; their third, those of "a selected number of representative non-European literatures" (p. 5); they will conclude with a volume in which they will try "to formulate some general principles in regard to the history of literature" (*loc. cit.*).

Vol. I, in spite of its title, treats of Germanic and Celtic as well as Greek speakings; in other words, the authors use *ancient* in its etymological sense, without particular reference to classical antiquity. More precisely, *ancient* here seems to mean 'pre-scribal' or something of the sort, and the Chadwicks would not classify Herodotus (for example) as an ancient author. On the other hand, the term *old* is avoided: such familiar terms as *Old English*, *Old Irish*, *Old Welsh*, *Old Norse*, *Old Icelandic*, *Old High German* do not appear. Instead, one finds a simple *English*, *Irish* etc., although *Anglo-Saxon* is used a good deal, apparently as a synonym of *English*. The term *English* itself is once limited to the 'ancient' period (p. 3 bottom); the succeeding periods, since they were cosmopolitan (p. ix bottom), presumably have, in strictness, no right to the English name. While all this is logical enough, and may even be sympathetic, in some sort, to a confirmed Saxonist

like the present reviewer, the break with ordinary usage makes difficulties for the reader and, on the whole, one must reckon the terminology unfortunate. It would have been better to make up new terms for the new meanings. These might have looked strange, indeed, but they would at any rate (like *speaking*) have had no previous history and the waters would have remained clear.

In theory the distinction between speakings and writings is easy enough; in practice, it is often exceedingly difficult. Thus, the Chadwicks include under speakings such works as the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and *Beowulf*, in spite of current critical opinion; one finds their arguments for the classification shrewd but hardly convincing. The permanent value of the work under review is to be found, not in the literary theories set forth by the authors, but in the literary material which they have brought together and catalogued. Their systematic comparison of the literary remains of early Greek, Germanic and Celtic civilization puts cheek by jowl many things kept far apart in most histories of literature, and time and again these juxtapositions turn out to be highly enlightening. In an earlier work, *The Heroic Age* (1912), one of the authors had already tried to do something of the sort, but the present series is much more inclusive and more ambitious generally. May the authors find time and strength to complete their great undertaking, so worthily begun!

KEMP MALONE

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*The Idea of Union in American Verse (1776-1876)*. By DOROTHY LEEDS WERNER. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932. Pp. 180. Miss Werner's dissertation consists of a miscellaneous collection of over 700 references to the union taken from American verse and roughly grouped, with some elementary comment, according to the attitude expressed. It is in no sense a study of the *idea* of union. For example, Whitman is represented only by two passing references to "O Captain! My Captain!" His attempt to show the "real Union, and how it may be accomplish'd" (in "Thou Mother with thy Equal Brood" and elsewhere) is ignored. Even as a collection it suffers from serious omissions. William Gilmore Simms and Henry Timrod are well-known poets who go unconsidered, and, indeed, the section dealing with "The Attack on the Union" fails to suggest that any southern poet ever questioned the sacredness of national unity. Periodical verse does not come within the scope nor regional anthologies within the accomplishment of the collection. The volume has a painstaking bibliography and index and should prove a serviceable,

if somewhat inadequate, guide for any one undertaking a more pointed study of the subject.

LEON HOWARD

*Pomona College*

---

*Le Journal des Savants et la Renommée de Pope en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* By JACQUELINE DE LA HARPE. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Volume 16, pp. 173-216. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933. Notices and articles concerning Pope appeared in the *Journal des Savants* from 1717 to 1786, and the author of this little brochure has extracted from them some very interesting generalizations regarding the French reception of Pope's work. The editors of the *Journal*, however, as she notes, were chiefly interested in the more philosophical works of Pope, and paid no attention to such poems as *The Rape of the Lock* and *Windsor Forest*, the popularity of which is attested to by many editions of their French translations.

*University of Michigan*

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

---

*The Songs of John Dryden.* Edited by CYRUS LAWRENCE DAY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. xvi + 199. \$2.50. Dryden's lyrical gifts have long been recognized, but his songs have nevertheless, curiously enough, received little attention, either from the general reader or the scholar. This beautifully printed volume aims particularly to exploit their musical value. It contains twenty-five facsimiles of the original airs, which are especially welcome, and gives extensive notes on such things as musical settings, appearances of the songs in miscellanies and song-books, imitations, and other related matters. The book is a valuable addition to the Dryden shelf.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

*University of Michigan*

---

*L'Angleterre et la Littérature anglaise dans les Trois Plus Anciens Périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709.* By H. J. REESINK. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1931. Pp. 433. The early French periodicals of Holland served as the medium of diffusion of English thought in Holland and France. Reesink's study of this aspect of their work is therefore an important contribution to the intellectual history of the eighteenth century. An analytical index to the reviews of English works in the three periodicals, adds greatly to the usefulness of the volume.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

*University of Michigan*



*Histoire de la Civilisation française des origines à nos jours.* Par CH.-M. DES GRANGES et OLIVER TOWLES. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1933. Pp. xxi + 473. \$2.75. A useful résumé of the main events in French political, military, social, industrial, literary, and artistic history, profusely illustrated, clear, and concise, the book has only a few misprints and is attractively presented to the public. Doubtless every scholar who examines it will find fault with one of its many sides—I should like, for instance, to discover some mention of Villon, Scarron, and Prévost, more than a passing remark about Calvin, d'Aubigné, and Diderot, a more accurate account of French seventeenth-century troupes than that found on p. 211, and the deletion of the statement that the "peuple proprement dit" did not go to the leading theaters (p. 212),—but the authors have had a difficult task, with so much to say in such brief space, and should be commended for including so many facts and opinions rather than criticized for occasional omissions or incomplete references. A satisfactory glossary is added to explain unusual terms; an index would have made the book still more useful.

H. C. L.

*Literary Sessions.* By ERIC PARTRIDGE. London: The Scholaris Press, 1932. Pp. x + 201. 7s. 6d. net. A group of fifteen essays, five on medical literature, five on minor writers of the nineteenth century (Corry, Robert Landor, Horne, Mrs. Clive, Ambrose Bierce), five on general subjects (fiction and public taste, etc.). All are thoughtful and readable.

THOMAS M. RAYSOR

University of Nebraska

*The Works of Thomas Otway: Plays, Poems, and Love-Letters.* Edited by J. C. GHOSH. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1932. 2 vols., pp. xii + 520; 542. 42s. This is valuable accession to the noble line of Oxford Press editions of the old dramatists. Mr. Ghosh has done his work crisply and authoritatively. The introduction, on the life and works, is both stimulating and sound. The texts are easily the best ever printed. Collation of a scattering of pages with copies of the original quartos revealed but a single error: Mr. Ghosh omits a period (1, 277) at the end of II, i, 242, of *Titus and Berenice*. It is of course quite possible that it failed to show in the two copies of the Quarto of 1677 which he examined. The commentary is excellent as far as it goes; it is not voluminous. About the only controversial aspect of Mr. Ghosh's labors is his definition of the canon: not even the appearance of a "definitive" edition will terminate discussion of that. The present writer shares

the scepticism of the anonymous reviewer of the London *Times* (*TLS.*, March 17, 1932) regarding Otway's authorship of the agonized letters to Mrs. Barry. Though he rightly decides not to withhold them from the reader, Mr. Ghosh ignores the question of their authenticity, despite the doubt he had previously expressed (*Notes and Queries*, 12th Series, XII, 103 ff.) as to Mrs. Barry's identity as the recipient. (See also R. G. Ham's *Otway and Lee*, pp. 82-83, 181-183, and his reply to Mr. Ghosh, *Notes and Queries*, cXLIX, 165-167.)

H. S.

---

*A Bibliographical Guide to Old English*, . . . compiled by ARTHUR H. HEUSINKVELD and EDWIN J. BASHE. Iowa City, 1931. Pp. 153. This useful book appears as Vol. IV, No. 5 of the *Humanistic Studies* published by the University of Iowa. The compilers in their subtitle describe their work as "a selective bibliography," and as such it must be judged. Opinions will naturally differ when it comes to the inclusion and exclusion of this or that in any compilation of this kind, but on the whole it may be said that the *Guide* is a distinct contribution to the apparatus needed for the convenient pursuit of OE studies.

K. M.

---

*Die Vercelli-Homilien*, zum ersten Male herausgegeben von MAX FÖRSTER. 1. Hälfte. Hamburg (Henri Grand), 1932. Pp. viii + 160. RM. 20. This half-volume is the first *heft* of the twelfth volume of the Grein-Wülker *Bibliothek der ags. Prosa*, now being continued under the editorship of Hans Hecht. The editor of the present volume is of all men the one most competent to undertake the task, and one is not surprised to find the *heft* under review a model piece of work. All Anglicists will await with impatience the completion of the volume.

K. M.

---

*The Vercelli Book*, edited by GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. New York, 1932. Pp. xciv + 152. \$3.50. *The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius*, edited by GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. New York, 1932. Pp. lvi + 239. \$4.00. We have here Vols. II and V of the new *corpus* of OE poetical writings which the Columbia University Press is getting out. Volume I, devoted to the Junius Codex, has already been given notice in this journal. The two volumes under review carry forward Mr. Krapp's worthy undertaking along the same lines, and may heartily be commended.

K. M.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received.]

Allen, Don Cameron. — Francis Meres's Treatise "Paetrie," A Critical Edition *Urbana*: Univ. of Ill. Press, 1933. Pp. 158. \$1.50.

Baldwin, Stanley E. — Charles Kingsley. *Ithaca*: Cornell Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 208. \$2.50. (Cornell Studies in English, XXV.)

Birnbaum, Johanna. — Die 'Memoirs' um 1700 (eine Studie zur Entwicklung der Realistischen Romankunst vor Richardson). *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. viii + 118. M. 4.50. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXIX.)

Blodgett, Harold. — Walt Whitman in England. *Ithaca*: Cornell Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xiv + 244. \$2.50. (Cornell Studies in English, XXIV.)

Ferguson, Walter D. — The Influence of Flaubert on George Moore. *Philadelphia*: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 108. \$1.50.

Hartman, Herbert (ed.). — Surrey's Fourth Boke of Virgil. *London and New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932. Pp. xxviii + 54 + 38 facsimiles. \$4.50. (250 copies only.)

Kapp, Rudolf. — Heilige und Heiligenlegenden in England. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. xiv + 372. M. 14. (Studien zum 16. und 17. Jh.)

Macan, R. W. (ed.). — Essays by Divers Hands. *London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933. Pp. xx + 162. \$2.75. (Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom, N. S. XII.)

Saul, George Brandon. — The Wedding of Sir Gawain and Dame Ragnell, Translated with an Introduction. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934. Pp. xiv + 30. \$0.50.

Massinger, Philip. — The City-Madam. Ed. Rudolf Kirk. *Princeton*: Princeton Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. x + 184. \$2.00. (Princeton Studies in English, 10.)

Stovall, Floyd. — Walt Whitman. Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes. *New York*: American Bk. Co., 1934. Pp. lxxiii + 426. \$1.50. (American Writers Series.)

Varney, Jeanne M. — Études sur L'américain. *Paris*: Presses Univ., 1933. Pp. 186.

Whiting, Bartlett Jere. — Chaucer's Use of Proverbs. *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 298. \$3.00. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, XI.)

Zachrisson, R. E. — English Place-Names in the Light of the Terminal Theory. *Uppsala*: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln. Pp. 25-90. 4 Sw. Kr.

## GERMAN

Bühmann, Max. — Johann Nepomuk Nestroys Parodien. Diss. *Kiel*: Schmidt & Klaunig, 1933. 193 pp.

Chen, Chuan. — Die chinesische schöne Literatur im deutschen Schriftum. Diss. *Kiel*: 1933. 108, 12 pp.

Diez, Erhard. — Rudolf Baumbach. Ein Beitrag zum Leben und Schaffen des Dichters. Diss. *Jena*. *Hildburghausen*: Gadow, 1933. 112 pp. 4.

Eberth, Hans Henrich. — Die Sprichwörter in Sebastian Brants Narrenschiff. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Sprichwortgeschichte. [Deutsches Werden. H. 3]. Diss. *Greifswald*: 1933. 110 pp. M. 3.60.

Gehring, Friedrich Wilhelm. — Die Leistung deutscher Prosabearbeiter im Rahmen der Geistesgeschichte des 15. Jhs. Diss. *Bonn*: 1933. Pp. 271-293.

Glattes, Lothar. — Wortbildung (durch Abtheilung) im oberen Markgräflischen. [Vogel Greif. H. 5]. *Lahr*: Schauenburg 1933. 59 pp. M. 3.60.

Gorlin, Michael. — N. V. Gogol und E. Th. A. Hoffmann. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin*: 1933. 58 pp.

Graham, Paul. — The Relation of History to Drama in the Works of Friedrich Hebbel. [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. XV, Nos. 1-2]. *Northampton, Mass.*: Smith College, 1934. iv, 107 pp.

Hoffmann, Maria Norberta. — Die Magdalenenszenen im geistlichen Spiel des deutschen Mittelalters. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. 67 pp.

Johannsen, Hans Peter. — Die seelische Passivität im Roman der Jahrhundertwende und ihre innere Überwindung (1890-1910). Diss. *Kiel*. *Hadersleben*: Schütze, 1933. iii, 99 pp.

Katz, Max-Otto. — Zur Weltanschauung Daniel Caspars von Lohenstein. Diss. *Breslau*: 1933. 47 pp.

Kauermann, Walther. — Das Vererbungsproblem im Drama des Naturalismus. Diss. *Kiel*: 1933. 135 pp.

Kern, Berthold. — Gustav Freytag, ein Publizist. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 111 pp.

Kern, Irmtraud. — Das höfische Gut in den Dichtungen Heinrich Frauenlobs. [Germanische Studien. H. 147]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 98 pp. M. 4.

Klennert, Adelheid. — Dante Gabriel Rossetti und Stefan George. Diss. *Bonn*. *Würzburg*: Mayr, 1933. 104 pp.

Krebs, Martin. — Hermann Stehr. Sein Werk im Zusammenhange des religiösen Bewußtseins der Gegenwart. Diss. Frankfurt. *Limburg a. d. L.*: Limburger Vereinsdruckerei, 1932. 73 pp.

Löfstedt, Ernst. — Grammatik der Mundart von Lesse im Kreise Wolfenbüttel (Braunschweig). [Ostfälische Studien I. = Lunds universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 29, No. 7]. *Leipzig*: Harrassowitz, 1933. 77 pp. M. 3.25.

Marwede, Wendelin. — Die Zwergsagen in Deutschland nördlich des Mains. Diss. *Köln*: 1933. 111 pp.

Mennie, Duncan M. — Die Personenbeschreibung im höfischen Epos der mhd. Epigonenzeit. Eine Stiluntersuchung. Diss. *Kiel*. *Halle*: Klincksieck, 1933. 154 pp.

Nacken, Edmund. — Studien über Eulogius Schneider in Deutschland. Diss. *Bonn*: 1933. 68 pp.

Runge, Reinhard. — Das Faust-Mephisto-Motiv in deutscher Dichtung. Diss. *Bonn*: 1933. xvi, 59 pp.

Salomon und Markolf. Die deutschen Dichtungen von —. II. Bd. Salomon und Markolf Das Spruchgedicht, hrsg. von Walter Hartmann. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. xlv, 80 pp. M. 5.40.

Schreiber, Carl F., and Sahlin, Nils G. — Minimum German. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1934. xiii, 151 pp. \$1.00.

Ständer, Karl. — Das Stilmittel des Zeugmas entgegengerichteter Begriffe in der mhd. Epik. Diss. Frankfurt. *Witten*: 1931. 76 pp.

Wagner, Hans. — Die rheinischen Martinslieder in liedgeographischer und motivgeschichtlicher Darstellung. Diss. *Köln*: 1933.

Wandrey, Conrad. — Kolbenheyer und das neue Deutschland. *München*: Georg Müller, 1934. 18 pp. 50 Pf.

### FRENCH

Alexis, J. E. A. — En France. *Lincoln, Neb.*: Midwest Bk. Co., 1934. x + 261 pp. \$1.40.

Bandy, W. T. — Baudelaire judged by his contemporaries. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933. x + 188 pp.

Becherer, W. — E. Psichari in seiner psychologischen Entwicklung. Diss. *Jena*: 1933. viii + 81 pp.

Beck, T. J. — Northern Antiquities in Fr. Learning and Literature (1755-1855). Vol. I. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1934. 195 pp.

Blanchard, M. — Marie Tudor, essai avec des notes inédites de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Boivin, 1934. 400 pp. Fr. 30.

Daudet. — Suffering, trans. M. Garver, with commentary and notes by A. Ebner. *New Haven*: Yale Press, 1934. 95 pp.

Ferran, A. — L'Esthétique de Baudelaire. *Paris*: Hachette, 1934. Fr. 60.

— Le Salon de 1845 de Ch. Baudelaire. *Paris*: Edit. de l'Archer, 1934. Fr. 40.

Glaser, H. — Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des franz.: Bauernromans von Rétif de la Bretonne bis zum Naturalismus. *Dresden*: Risse-Verlag, 1933. 103 pp.

Goodridge, G. W. F. R. — Advanced Fr. comp. *London and New York*: Oxford Press, 1934. 180 pp. \$1.60.

Grégoire, A. — L'Astronomie dans l'œuvre de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 243 pp. Fr. 55.

Haller, E. — Analyse einer illuminierten franz.: Handschrift aus dem Anfang des 15 Jh. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1933. 38 pp.

Katzenellenbogen, L. — Eine altfranz.: Abhandlung über Fieber. Diss. *Berlin*: 1933. 47 pp.

King, S. M. — Barrès. La pensée allemande et le problème du Rhin. *Paris*: Champion, 1934. 292 pp. Fr. 45. (Bib. de la RLC.)

Knauer, K. — Studien zur Geschichte der Farbenbestimmung im Franz.: von den Anfängen bis gegen Ende des 18 Jh. *Geneva*: Olschki, 1933. 58 pp.

Korwin-Piotrowska, S. de. — Balzac et le Monde slave. 2 vol. *Paris*: Champion, 1934. 519 + 120 pp. Fr. 80. (Bib. de la RLC.)

Luzzatto, A. — Rimbaud, Onofri, Valéri. *Genoa*: Orfini, 1933. 141 pp.

Penn, D. — The staging of the "Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages" of Ms. Cangé. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933. 95 pp.

Pillet, A. — Bibliographie der Troubadours. Ergänzt, weitergeführt und herausgegeben von H. Carstens. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. 518 pp.

Pousland, E. — Etude sémantique de l'Anglicisme dans le Parler franco-américain de Salem. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 310 pp.

Richter, Elise. — Die Entwicklung des neuesten Französischen. *Leipzig*: Velhagen & Klasing, 1933. 106 pp.

Roger, N. — Jean-Jacques le promeneur solitaire. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1934. 392 pp.

Schmitt, R. — Der Pseudoturpin Harley 273. *Wüzburg*: Rom. Sem., 1933. 93 pp.

Schommodau, H. — Der franz.: psychologische Wortsatz der zweiten Hälfte des 18 Jh. *Leipzig*: Rom. Sem., 1933. 176 pp.

Voltaire. — Crist, G. M. "V. Barcochebas and the early French Deists." *FR*, VI. 483-489.

Wagner, W. — Stendhals Beziehung zum 18 Jh. Teil 1: Der Roman. *Dresden*: Risse-Verlag, 1933. 32 pp.

Wartburg, W.—*Evolution et structure de la langue fr. Leipzig: Teubner, 1934. viii + 242 pp.*

## ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—*La vita di —, scritta da esso. Edizione per le scuole, con prefazione, note e saggi illustrativi scelti nelle altre opere dell'Alfieri per cura di U. Martinelli. Milano: A. Vallardi, 1933. 396 pp.*

Cappa, I.—Giosuè Carducci. *Pisa: V. Lischi e figli, 1933. 32 pp.*

Cenami, Valeria.—*La Divina Commedia nelle traduzioni di H. W. Longfellow e di H. F. Cary. Lucca: Tip. edit. G. Giusti, 1933. 60 pp.*

Collodi, C. [Lorenzini, Carlo].—*Minuzzolo. Libro per i ragazzi, riordinato da G. Scortecchi. Firenze: A. Salani, 1932. 304 pp. L. 3.*

De Franceschi, C.—*Dante e Pola. Parenzo: G. Coana e figli, 1933. 67 pp.*

Fantozzi, Dino.—*Scritti scelti. Prefazione di D. Giuliotti. Firenze: A. Vallecchi, 1933. ix + 411 pp. L. 6.*

Foscolo, Ugo.—*I sepolcri, le odi e i sonetti. Introduzione e note di M. Sterpa. Firenze: "La nuova Italia," 1933. 78 pp. L. 2.50. (Scrittori italiani.)*

—Le poesie perfette e saggi delle prose: Odi; Sonetti; De' Sepolcri; ecc. Con un discorso e commento di V. G. Gualtieri. *Palermo: S. Andò e figli, 1933. 170 pp. L. 5. (Scrittori italiani, no. 1.)*

Galizi, I.—*Figure e ricordi del mio paese. Rassegna bio-bibliografica degli illustri e notabili di Polignano a mare. Prefazione di S. La Sorsa. Appendice: Blasonario polignanese. Putignano: A. De Robertis e figli, 1932. 128 pp. L. 8.*

Gastaldi, M.—*Onorato Fava. La vita e le opere. Milano: "Quaderni di poesia," di E. Cavalleri, 1933. 77 pp. L. 5.*

Giardini, C.—*I racconti di papà Goldoni. Commedie di Carlo Goldoni narrate da —. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1932. 184 pp. (La scala d'oro, serie VI, no. 10.)*

Giuliotti, D.—*Le due luci: cantità, poesia. Torino: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1933. 258 pp. L. 10.*

Lanza, A.—*La lirica amorosa veneziana del secolo XVI. Verona: R. Cabianca, 1933. viii + 54 pp. L. 6.*

Mascia, F. S.—*La poesia di Cecco Angiolieri. Roma: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1933. 68 pp. L. 3.*

Michieli, A.—*Commento a Pinocchio. Torino: F.lli Bocca, 1933. 163 pp. L. 10. (Piccola biblioteca di scienze moderne, no. 401.)*

Monti, Vincenzo.—*Tre lettere inedite a cura di P. Franciosi. Faenza: F.lli Lega, 1933. 14 pp.*

Pellico, Silvio.—*Le mie prigioni. Memorie di — da Saluzzo. Con prefazione di A. Luzio. Torino: G. B. Paravia, 1932. xviii + 191 pp. L. 6.50. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)*

Petrarca, Francesco.—*Rime scelte e commentate da C. Steiner. Torino: G. B. Paravia e C., 1933. viii + 171 pp. L. 7. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)*

Quintavalle, F.—*Opera omnia di Francesco D'Ovidio. Napoli: A. Guida, 1933. 61 pp.*

Rapisardi, Mario.—*Scherzi: versi siciliani, a cura di A. Tomaselli. Catania: Casa edit. "Etna," 1933. 103 pp. L. 6. (Collana storica, letteraria e folklorica siciliana, no. 1.)*

Rocca, P.—*Riflessi delle "Georgiche" nel "Furioso." Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1933. 51 pp. L. 4. (Repr. fr. the "Annuario del r. liceo-ginnasio "L. Ariosto" di Ferrara, 1932-33.)*

Romagnoli, E.—*Il canto VIII dell'Inferno letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. 38 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)*

Settanni, E.—*Romanzo e romanzieri d'oggi. Napoli: A. Guida, 1933. 117 pp. L. 4.50.*

Spinelli, V.—*Il linguaggio come musica ritmica ed i cori parlati in quanto sinfonie suscitatrici di vita. Seconda edizione interamente rifatta. Firenze: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 78 pp. L. 8.*

Tommaseo, Niccolò, e Capponi, Gino.—*Carteggio inedito dal 1833 al 1874 per cura di Isidoro Del Lungo e Paolo Prunas. Volume IV, parte II: Torino, 1859. Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1932. vii + 228 pp. L. 18.*

Treves, E.—*La leggenda d'Orlando, narrata da —. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1933. 188 pp. (La scala d'oro, serie VI, no. 4.)*

Valeri, D.—*Il romanzo di Guerrino il Meschino, narrato da —. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1932. 154 pp. (La scala d'oro, serie VI, no. 2.)*

Venturi, G. A.—*Il canto IX dell'Inferno letto da — nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. 32 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)*

## SPANISH

Altamira, R.—*Historia de la civilización española. [Hasta 1914.] Madrid: Aguilar, 1933. 382 pp. 10 ptas.*

Arniches, C.—*Teatro escogido. Tomo IV. Madrid: Estampa, 1932. 203 pp.*

Bosch Gimpera, P.—*El problema de los cántabros y de su origen. Santander: Imp. Vda de F. Fons, 1933. (Tirada aparte del "Bol. de la Bibl. de Menéndez y Pelayo.")*

Cárdenas, J. F. de.—*Hispanic culture and language in the United States. Nueva York: Instituto de las Españas, 1933. 40 pp.*

Cossío, J. M. de.—Noticia de D. Manuel de la Cuesta y sus versos. *Santander*: Imp. Vda. de F. Fons, 1933. 94 pp. (Tirada aparte del "Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez y Pelayo.")

Díez y Jiménez Castellanos, P.—Introducción al estudio de la literatura española. *Barcelona*: Clarasó, 1933. 270 pp.

Fernández Almagro, M.—Historia del reinado de Alfonso XIII. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1933. 611 pp. 16 ptas.

Fishtine, E.—Don Juan Valera, the critic. *Bryn Mawr, Pa.*: 1933. 120 pp.

Ford, H. E. and J. Cano.—A new Spanish Reader. *New York*: Holt, 1934. xiii + 267 + xxxvii pp. \$0.96.

Iriarte.—Fábulas. *Barcelona*: Araluce, 1933. 52 pp. 6 ptas.

Leavitt, S. E. and C. García-Prada.—A tentative bibliography of Colombian Literature. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard University Press, 1934. 80 pp.

Levillier, R.—Biografías de conquistadores de la Argentina en el siglo XVI. Tucumán. Segunda ed. *Madrid*: Pueyo, 1933. xxiv + 250 pp.

Long, W. R.—La flor de las ystorias de Orient, by Hayton Prince of Gorigos. *Chicago*: The University of Chicago Press, 1934. ix + 223 pp. \$2.00.

Morris Bishop.—The Odyssey of Cabeza de Vaca. *New York*: The Century Co., 1933. 306 pp.

Ontañón, E. de.—El cura Merino. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1933. 254 pp.

Pfandl, L.—Historia de la literatura nacional española en la edad de oro. *Barcelona*: Suc. de Juan Gili, 1933. xv + 693 pp. 28 ptas.

Richardson, R.—Florencio Sánchez and the Argentine Theater. *Nueva York*: Instituto de las Españas, 1933. 243 pp. \$2.60.

Rivera, G.—A tentative bibliography of the belles-lettres of Ecuador. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard University Press, 1934. 76 pp.

Torres-Rioseco, A. y R. E. Warner.—Bibliografía de la poesía mexicana. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard University Press, 1934. xxxix + 86 pp.

Unamuno, M. de.—El otro. Misterio en tres jornadas. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1932. 91 pp. 3.50 ptas.

Vossler, K.—Lope de Vega y su tiempo. Trad. de R. de la Serna. *Madrid*: Edit. "Revista de Occidente," 1934. 366 pp. 16 ptas.

Zaldumbide, G.—Significado de España en América. *New York*: Instituto de las Españas, 1933. 34 pp.

## PORTUGUESE

Alfonso X el Sabio.—Cantigas de Santa Maria. Ed. por [M.] Rodrigues Lapa. *Lisboa*: Imp. Nacional, 1933. viii + 101 pp.

Alves, F. M.—Catálogo dos manuscritos de Simancas respeitantes á historia portuguesa. *Coimbra*: 1933. 168 pp.

Callander, M.—Vantagens e discrepâncias da nova ortografia. *Pernambuco*: 1932. 65 pp.

Campos Ferreira Lima, H. de.—Garrett diplomata. *Gaia*: 1932. 94 pp.

Correia, J. da S.—A rima e a sua acção linguística e ideológica. *Lisboa*: 1930. 336 pp.

Cotarelo Valledor, A.—Los hermanos Eans Mariño, poetas gallegos del siglo XIII. *Madrid*: Tip. de Archivos, 1933. 32 pp.

Ferreira Lima, H. de.—As paródias na Literatura Portuguesa, ensaio bibliográfico. *Lisboa*: 1930. 61 pp.

Huber, J.—Altportugiesisches Elementarbuch. *Heidelberg*: C. Winter, 1933. 356 pp.

Marrecas Ferreira, E.—Aljubarrota. Pequena monografia. *Lisboa*: 1932. 110 pp.

Menino, P.—Livro de Falcoaria. Publicado com introdução, notas e glossário por Rodrigues Lapa. *Coimbra*: Imp. da Univ., 1931. lviii + 91 pp. + 3 lms.

Nascentes, A.—Dicionário Etimológico da Língua Portuguesa. *Rio de Janeiro*: 1932. xlviii + 829 pp.

Peixoto, A.—Ensaio camonianos. *Coimbra*: Imp. da Universidade, 1932. 426 pp.

Quental, A. de.—Prosas. Vol. III. *Coimbra*: 1931. 232 pp.

Rebêlo Gonçalves, F.—A fala do Velho do Restelo. Aspectos clássicos deste episódio camoniano. *Lisboa*: Imp. Nacional, 1933. 72 pp.

Sá Nogueira, R.—Curso de filologia portuguesa. I parte: Noções gerais de Fonética histórica. *Lisboa*: Fernandes, Jr., 1932. 124 pp.

Silva Bastos.—Estrangeirismos, erros e vícios da linguagem. *Lisboa*: 1933. 16 + 181 pp.

## GENERAL

Hallig, R.—Die Benennungen der Bachstelze in den romanischen Sprachen und Mundarten. *Leipzig*: Rom. Sem., 1933. 100 pp.

Vries, J. de.—De Skaldenkenningen met mythologischen Inhoud. *Haarlem*: Willink & Zoon, 1934. 85 pp.

—The Problem of Loki. *Helsingfors*: Soc. Scientiarum Fennica, 1933. 306 pp. (FF Communications, XLIII, no. 110.)

Thompson, D. V. and Hamilton, G. H.—An anonymous fourteenth-century treatise, De Arte illuminandi, the technique of MS illumination, trans. from the Latin of Naples MS XII. E. 27. *New Haven*: Yale Press, 1933. xiv + 67 pp.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIX

JUNE, 1934

Number 6

---

## CHATEAUBRIAND ET MARCEL PROUST

Soucieux d'apparenter son inspiration et sa technique "à des traits moins marqués, mais reconnaissables, discernables et, au fond, assez analogues chez certains écrivains," Marcel Proust a pris soin d'indiquer lui-même (*Temps Retrouvé*, II, 82) la lignée littéraire dont son œuvre est issue: et il cite, dans l'ordre, Chateaubriand, Gérard de Nerval et Baudelaire. Sans doute le dernier nommé est-il son plus proche parent par la doctrine et les affinités; mais Chateaubriand garde à ses yeux le prestige particulier qu'il eut, en fait, pour tout le dix-neuvième siècle: celui de l'aïeul et du pionnier.

La critique a doté Marcel Proust d'une foule de devanciers et d'émules spirituels,—la plupart imaginaires; par contre, elle s'est montrée singulièrement discrète en ce qui concerne l'influence de Chateaubriand.<sup>1</sup> Pour rendre à celui-ci la justice qui lui est due, relisons, s'il vous plaît, cette importante page 82, et voyons avec quelle remarquable sûreté de goût Marcel Proust extrait des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe* deux passages des plus significatifs et,—le second surtout,—d'une résonance toute moderne:

N'est-ce pas,—écrit-il,—à mes sensations du genre de celle de la madeleine qu'est suspendue la plus belle partie des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*: "Hier au soir, je me promenais seul . . . Je fus tiré de mes réflexions par le gazouillement d'une grive perchée sur la plus haute branche d'un bouleau. A l'instant, ce son magique fit reparaître à mes yeux le domaine paternel; j'oubliai les catastrophes dont je venais d'être le témoin et,

---

<sup>1</sup> Le regretté Arnaud Dandieu, dont l'ouvrage: *Marcel Proust, sa révélation psychologique* (Paris, Didot, 1930), a renouvelé la critique proustienne, cite intégralement, aux pp. 92-93 de son propre livre, le passage du *Temps Retrouvé* sur Chateaubriand. Mais il n'entrait nullement dans son sujet de développer un parallèle entre l'auteur du *Côté de chez Swann* et celui des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*.

transporté subitement dans le passé, je revis ces campagnes où j'entendis si souvent siffler la grive." Et une des deux ou trois plus belles phrases de ces *Mémoires* n'est-elle pas celle-ci: "Une odeur fine et suave d'héliotrope s'exhalait d'un petit carré de fèves en fleurs; elle ne nous était point apportée par une brise de la patrie, mais par un vent sauvage de Terre-Neuve, sans relation avec la plante exilée, sans sympathie de réminiscence et de volupté. Dans ce parfum, non respiré de la beauté, non épuré dans son sein, non répandu sur ses traces, dans ce parfum chargé d'aurore, de culture et de monde, il y avait toutes les mélancolies des regrets, de l'absence et de la jeunesse."<sup>2</sup>

C'est en juillet 1817 qu'un tout petit incident,—le gazouillement de la grive,—ramène Chateaubriand au cœur même des bruyères bretonnes et de son adolescence. Marcel Proust en est frappé parce qu'il s'agit là, non point d'une évocation ordinaire de la mémoire intellectuelle, mais d'une véritable résurrection du passé opérée par la mémoire affective. La mémoire volontaire donne des renseignements sur le passé; seule, la mémoire affective a le pouvoir féérique de le faire revivre à notre usage. Il suffit,—mais cette sensation même est très rare, et Proust s'estime fortuné pour l'avoir éprouvée six ou sept fois dans sa vie,—il suffit d'un ébranlement fortuit venu de l'extérieur:

Qu'un bruit, qu'une odeur, déjà entendu ou respirée jadis, le soient de nouveau, à la fois dans le présent et dans le passé . . . aussitôt l'essence permanente et habituellement cachée des choses se trouve libérée et notre vrai moi qui parfois depuis longtemps, semblait mort, mais ne l'était pas autrement, s'éveille, s'anime en recevant la céleste nourriture qui lui est apportée. Une minute affranchie de l'ordre du temps a recréé en nous pour la sentir l'homme affranchi de l'ordre du temps.<sup>3</sup>

Proust nous prévient d'ailleurs qu'il trouve fort raisonnable la croyance celtique selon laquelle l'âme des morts, l'âme du passé tout entier, se dissimule, muette et captive, dans un humble objet: une pierre, un toit, un son de cloche, une odeur de feuilles; se dissimule, muette, captive, et perdue pour nous jusqu'au jour, qui pour beaucoup ne vient jamais, où un hasard heureux nous découvre sa prison et nous permet de lui rendre la parole et la vie.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, édition Biré, I, 125 et 343.

<sup>3</sup> *Le Temps Retrouvé*, II, 16.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 45-46 et 166. De même, les émotions de Chateaubriand sont associées à de minuscules épisodes de la vie de la nature: le vent du soir qui brise les réseaux tendus par l'insecte sur la pointe des herbes; l'alouette de bruyère qui se pose sur un caillou (cf. *Mémoires*



Ainsi donc, et à la lettre, Combourg se trouvait enclos, donjon et forêts, dans le sifflement d'une grive, de même que Combray le devait être, ville et jardins, dans la saveur d'une madeleine et d'une tasse de thé. Et bien plus que Combourg, bien plus que Combray : tout le temps révolu, toute la jeunesse. Le temps perdu, en effet, ce n'est pas seulement le temps gaspillé aux frivolités et aux passions ; c'est le temps où les chimères, n'ayant point encore été passées au feu de l'expérience, étaient bel et bien des réalités, et où l'on ne savait pas le visage de la mort. Au milieu de l'écoulement des choses, de la disparition des êtres et de la chute des illusions, Chateaubriand s'accroche à Combourg et Marcel Proust à Combray comme au seul "gisement profond du sol mental," au seul "terrain résistant" où s'appuyer encore. "La plupart de mes sentiments,—avoue Chateaubriand,—sont demeurés au fond de mon âme. . . . Je veux remonter le penchant de mes belles années." Combray,—dit Marcel Proust,—a "constitué à tout jamais pour moi la figure des pays où j'aimerais vivre."<sup>5</sup> Les fleurs qu'il n'a point rencontrées du côté de Guermantes ou de Méséglise ne lui semblent point de vraies fleurs, et, lui montrât-on de plus beaux nymphéas que ceux de la Vivonne, cette flore familière, mais transplantée, ne le satisferait guère davantage :

Ce que je veux revoir,—s'écrit-il,—c'est le côté de Guermantes que j'ai connu . . . ce sont ces prairies où, quand le soleil les rend réfléchissantes comme une mare, se dessinent les feuilles des pommiers, c'est ce paysage dont parfois, la nuit dans mes rêves, l'individualité m'étreint avec une puissance presque fantastique et que je ne peux plus retrouver au réveil.

Ainsi rejoint-il la méditation poignante de Chateaubriand devant un carré de fleurs d'Europe, en exil, comme lui-même, au pied des mornes solitaires de Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon, et qui lui parlent des vrais, des seuls paradis,—les paradis qu'on a perdus.<sup>7</sup>

Que Marcel Proust soit un romantique, c'est-à-dire avant tout un émotif et un inspiré, nul ne peut en douter sérieusement aujourd'hui. On a prétendu, non sans raison, qu'il n'avait fait que

*d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 152). Ces menues notations relèvent d'un art impressionniste très original à son époque.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 4, et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 170.

<sup>6</sup> *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 171.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Le Temps Retrouvé*, II, 13.

recommencer le *Lac* et la *Tristesse d'Olympio*: mais combien serait-il plus juste encore de dire qu'il a recommencé Combourg!

Il n'y a pas lieu, je crois,—parce que nous entrerions dans le domaine des hypothèses aventureuses,—d'insister sur la consonance fraternelle des noms de Combray et de Combourg. On ne saurait non plus faire grand état de l'existence, à Combourg comme à Combray, de deux côtés individuels et nettement différenciés: le nord et l'ouest, où s'étendent les grands bois, comme dans la direction de Méséglise; le midi et l'est, où sont le village, l'étang, les prairies et les saules, comme dans celle de Guermantes.<sup>8</sup> Pareille opposition, chez Chateaubriand, demeure une pure matière de points cardinaux, et l'on ne voit pas qu'il ait reconstruit et "stylisé" ces deux aspects de la nature, pour en faire des pôles distincts de son imagination et de son cœur.

En revanche, tous les thèmes de paysage et de rêverie romantiques légués au dix-neuvième siècle par le livre III des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, nous les retrouvons, reproduits et amplifiés, dans le miroir proustien. C'est le vent, "génie particulier de Combray," qui parcourt les champs tel "un chemineau invisible," et qui fait s'envoler les corbeaux.<sup>9</sup> C'est la lune, entrevue l'après-midi,—car Proust se couchait de bonne heure,—ou qui glisse jusqu'au pied du lit "son échelle enchantée".<sup>10</sup> C'est le soleil, fidèle compagnon des songeries au bord de l'eau.<sup>11</sup> C'est la pluie, "dont le ciel est plus obscurci qu'au départ des hirondelles."<sup>12</sup> C'est l'automne, la saison entre les saisons, où Proust part à l'aventure, drapé dans un grand plaid à rayures écossaises, et lutte avec allégresse contre les éléments déchaînés.<sup>13</sup> C'est l'exaltation qui se dégage de la solitude, et celle qui naît, vague et précise tout à

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 73-74.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 136, 140, etc.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 13 et 136-137. Chateaubriand dit pareillement: "Lorsque la lune brillait et qu'elle s'abaissait à l'occident, j'en étais averti par ses rayons, qui venaient à mon lit au travers des carreaux losangés de la fenêtre" (*Mémoires*, I, 137).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 153, et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 153, 158, etc.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 140. Est-ce une réminiscence et une transposition du départ des hirondelles chez Chateaubriand? (*Mémoires*, I, 155).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 142-145.

la fois, du désir adolescent d'une femme: paysanne de Rous-sainville,<sup>14</sup> visage, déjà plus irréel, de Gilberte Swann,<sup>15</sup> ou princesse lointaine, imaginaire et aristocratique comme la sylphide de Chateaubriand:

Je rêvais que Mme de Guermantes me faisait venir dans le parc de son château, éprise pour moi d'un soudain caprice. Tout le jour elle y pêchait la truite avec moi. Et le soir me tenant par la main, en passant devant les petits jardins de ses vassaux, elle me montrait le long des murs bas, les fleurs qui y appuient leurs quenouilles violettes et rouges, et m'apprenait leurs noms.<sup>16</sup>

C'est encore le retour au crépuscule, le cœur lourd et révolté contre les êtres et les choses qui ne répondent pas à son appel:

En vain, tenant l'étendue dans le champ de ma vision, je la drainais de mes regards qui eussent voulu en ramener une femme. . . . Je fixais indéfiniment le tronc d'un arbre lointain, de derrière lequel elle allait surgir et venir à moi; l'horizon scruté restait désert, la nuit tombait, c'était sans espoir que mon attention s'attachait, comme pour aspirer les créatures qu'ils pouvaient recéler, à ce sol stérile, à cette terre épuisée.<sup>17</sup>

Et c'est enfin, en accord avec l'inquiétude sentimentale, la naissance de l'inquiétude intellectuelle; l'anxiété de vivre, de vieillir et de mourir sans rien faire ni trouver de plus que les autres hommes; la persuasion d'être nul, "incapable de s'élever au-dessus du vulgaire"; la conviction de n'avoir "pas de génie," "pas de dispositions pour les lettres,"<sup>18</sup> qui n'est, après tout, que la première forme, et très normale, du tourment d'écrire.

Les coquelicots du côté de Méséglise, hissant leur flamme rouge au-dessus de leur bouée graisseuse et noire, faisaient battre le cœur de Proust, "comme au voyageur qui aperçoit sur une terre basse une première barque échouée que répare un calfat, et s'écrie, avant de l'avoir encore vue: La Mer!"<sup>19</sup> Ce rivage symbolique, promis à son attente, c'est, bien entendu, l'œuvre qu'il porte en lui, sans rien savoir de son nom, de sa forme, de son contenu. Il n'en prendra conscience que beaucoup plus tard, quand sa propre vie

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 145-147.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 132-133.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 160.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 147.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 159, et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 160 et 165.

<sup>19</sup> *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 130.

lui aura confirmé la leçon secrète et diffuse des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*: à savoir, qu'il n'existe pas de littérature du présent. Comme la mémoire jaillit de l'oubli, la création artistique jaillit de l'absence. Pour que Combours, ou Combray, deviennent objets de littérature, il faut, non les posséder, mais les avoir d'abord possédés et perdus. Or précisément, ces mêmes sensations, éprouvées à la fois dans le passé et dans le présent, dont nous avons vu qu'elles constituent les sommets de l'expérience intime, satisfont tout aussi bien à l'exigence contradictoire d'actualité et d'absence qui est le principe de l'œuvre d'art. Le rôle de l'artiste est donc de les saisir au passage pour cristalliser le sentiment d'éternité qu'elles dégagent, en quelque sorte, à l'état volatil, et l'œuvre d'art fonde ses prétentions à la durée, non point, cela va de soi, sur le papillotement des images, comme le croyait le snob Legrandin; non pas même sur les jeux de l'intelligence, comme l'écrivain Bergotte en avait trop longtemps nourri l'illusion, mais sur ces révélations infrequentes, fugitives et sans prix, dont la "gouttelette presque impalpable" soutient victorieusement "l'édifice immense du souvenir."<sup>20</sup>

Ce n'est donc plus l'âme seule qu'une minute affranchie de l'ordre du temps transporte, pour la sentir, hors des frontières du temps: le testament que cette âme laisse à la postérité participe du même privilège et le consacre à tout jamais. Combours, beaucoup moins décrit que transcrit sous la dictée naïve d'un oiseau; Combray, respiré et reconnu dans le parfum d'une tasse de thé, ne sont plus mesurables en termes de passé ni de présent, et tout effort pour les "situer" dans le courant des jours est voué à l'impuissance:

Parfois,—confesse Marcel Proust,<sup>21</sup>—ce morceau de paysage amené ainsi jusqu'à aujourd'hui se détache si isolé de tout qu'il flotte incertain dans ma pensée comme une Délos fleurie, sans que je puisse dire de quel pays, de quel temps,—peut-être tout simplement de quel rêve,—il vient.

Et Chateaubriand, pour une fois, fournit un témoignage plus proustien que celui de Proust lui-même:

Les divers sentiments de mes âges divers, ma jeunesse pénétrant dans ma vieillesse, la gravité de mes années d'expérience attristant mes années légères, les rayons de mon soleil, depuis son aurore jusqu'à son couchant, se croisant et se confondant comme les reflets épars de mon existence,

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 48.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 170.

donnent une sorte d'unité indéfinissable à mon travail: mon berceau a de ma tombe, ma tombe a de mon berceau; mes souffrances deviennent des plaisirs, mes plaisirs des douleurs, et l'on ne sait si ces *Mémoires* sont l'ouvrage d'une tête brune ou chenue." <sup>22</sup>

Il convient donc de soustraire ces paysages, ces états d'âme "retrouvés," aux fluctuations et aux contingences de la durée concrète, qui n'est pas, ou qui n'est plus, leur véritable élément. Rendus à leur sphère intemporelle, dûment situés au-dessus et au-delà de la vie et de la mort, ils acquièrent au contraire une fixité, une individualité, une nécessité quasi mystiques. Chateaubriand voit l'objet comme s'il était devant ses yeux; son cœur bat au point de repousser la table sur laquelle il écrit: et cependant, que signifie tout cela pour le reste des hommes?

J'ai eu,—dit-il,—à réveiller un monde qui n'était connu que de moi; je n'ai rencontré, en errant dans cette société évanouie, que des souvenirs et le silence; de toutes les personnes que j'ai connues, combien en existe-t-il aujourd'hui?

A quoi Proust répond, comme en écho:

Ce coin de nature, ce bout de jardin n'eussent pu penser que ce serait grâce à un enfant qu'ils seraient appelés à survivre en leurs particularités les plus éphémères; et pourtant, . . . mon exaltation les a portés et a réussi à leur faire traverser tant d'années successives, tandis qu'alentour les chemins se sont effacés et que sont morts ceux qui les foulèrent et le souvenir de ceux qui les foulèrent.<sup>23</sup>

L'œuvre d'art, où se réfugie et s'apaise cette exaltation, surgit donc au milieu des ruines comme une consolation et une espérance. Ce fut son rôle constant à travers toutes les variations doctrinales du dix-neuvième siècle. Elle est une revanche sur la vie et une conquête, au moins partielle, sur la mort. Elle a une signification religieuse. Les *Mémoires* de Chateaubriand sont un temple,—un temple dédié à la Mort,—un temple toutefois, qu'il élève à la clarté de ses souvenirs.<sup>24</sup> L'œuvre de Proust, d'une architecture plus païenne, n'en baigne pas moins dans la même lumière et témoigne du même besoin. Que l'art soit la préfiguration d'une vie future ne lui paraît pas une idée sans vraisemblance. Il aime croire que

<sup>22</sup> *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, xlviii (*Préface testamentaire*).

<sup>23</sup> *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, liv (*Avant-Propos*), et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 170.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 4.

Ver Meer n'eût pas peint avec tant de science et d'amour un tout petit pan de mur jaune s'il n'eût dû recueillir, dans un monde meilleur, fondé sur le scrupule et le sacrifice, sa justification et sa récompense; et, sur la couche funèbre de Bergotte, il imagine ses livres, disposés trois par trois derrière les vitrines, qui veillent, comme des anges aux ailes éployées, en symbole de résurrection.<sup>25</sup>

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

*Princeton University*

### PARNY AS AN OPPONENT OF SLAVERY

The majority of modern critics have summarily banished Evariste Parny from the society of the more significant French poets. This hostility may be explained largely as a reaction against his later poetry, which is admittedly inferior, and particularly against his infamous poem, *La Guerre des Dieux*. Some years ago, Faguet said, in a public lecture on Parny, "De tous les poètes français, et même de tous les poètes de l'univers, Parny est celui pour lequel j'ai le mépris le plus profond."<sup>1</sup> Potez, granting the importance of Parny's influence on elegiac verse, declares that "si l'on en excepte ses *Poésies érotiques*, toute son œuvre, ou peu s'en faut, est au-dessous du médiocre,"<sup>2</sup> while the poet lies buried in a long footnote to Lanson's section on "La Poésie sans poésie."<sup>3</sup> Through an unwarranted suppression of certain aspects of Parny's works, these judgments, on whatever basis they are made, create a totally inadequate picture of the poet's contribution to eighteenth-century thought.

Because of his active interest in Negro slavery, Parny deserves recognition as a participant in one of the most conspicuous humanitarian movements of his century. The establishment of this point will make it less easy to class Parny, as Lanson does, with those poets in whose works "on ne rencontre pas un éclat de passion, pas une impression, pas une image: aucune trace fraîche enfin

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *La Prisonnière*, I, 256.

<sup>1</sup> *Revue des cours et conférences*, No. 9 (1907), p. 402.

<sup>2</sup> *L'Élégie en France avant le romantisme*, Paris, 1897, p. 88.

<sup>3</sup> *Histoire de la littérature française*, 22d ed., revised; Paris, n. d., p. 641.

de la nature ou de la vie";<sup>4</sup> nor will it appear wholly true, as Potez thinks, that Parny "n'a point la préoccupation des mœurs variées et des usages pittoresques qui se rencontrent parmi les peuples."<sup>5</sup>

Such preoccupation, on the contrary, is manifest not only in several of Parny's poems, but even more prominently in his epistolary poetry. In his youth and during his travels he had witnessed and denounced the abuses to which the unfortunate slaves were subjected in his native Ile Bourbon and in South America. At the age of twenty he wrote to his brother from Rio de Janeiro, describing the charms of that "paradis terrestre." He concludes that à tous ces avantages il en manque un, qui seul peut donner du prix aux autres, c'est la liberté: tout est ici dans l'esclavage; on y peut entrer, mais on n'en sort guère. En général les colons sont mécontents et fatigués de leur sort.<sup>6</sup>

Returning to the Ile Bourbon after a short residence in Paris, Parny wrote in 1775 to his friend, Bertin:

Je te sais bon gré, mon ami, de ne pas oublier les Nègres dans les instructions que tu me demandes . . . Non, je ne saurais me plaire dans un pays où mes regards ne peuvent tomber que sur le spectacle de la servitude, où le

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 641.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 110.

<sup>6</sup> *Œuvres d'Evariste Parny*, Paris, 1808, I, 216-217.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 230. While Bertin, too, was a Creole poet, his published works, *Poésies et œuvres diverses*, Paris, 1879, contain but one significant reference to the Negro race:

Vous verriez bien, troupe insensée,  
Qui n'avez point de Colisée,  
De grands sauteurs, ni d'arlequins,  
Que d'un Dieu bienfaisant et sage  
Nous seuls annonçons le dessein:  
L'Européen est son ouvrage;  
Mais le nez plat d'un Africain  
Ne sauroit être à son image.

*Aux Sauvages*, p. 229.

It is interesting to notice that Bertin, in this ironical pretense of anthropological superiority, utilizes not the color of the skin, but the same facial trait as does Montesquieu, in an equally ironical passage of the *Esprit des lois*: "Ceux dont il s'agit sont noirs depuis les pieds jusqu'à la tête, et ils ont le nez si écrasé qu'il est presque impossible de les plaindre." (Livre xv, chap. v.) Cf. also Voltaire, *Lettres d'Amabed* (1769), No. 7: "Nos sages ont dit que l'homme est l'image de Dieu: voilà une plaisante image de l'Etre éternel qu'un nez noir épaté . . ."

bruit des fouets et des chaînes étourdit mon oreille et retentit dans mon cœur. Je ne vois que des tyrans et des esclaves, et je ne vois pas mon semblable. On troque tous les jours un homme contre un cheval: il est impossible que je m'accoutume à une bizarrerie si révoltante.<sup>8</sup>

This long letter shows clearly that Parny's interest in slavery was by no means transitory. His zeal was unfeigned, and his criticism was founded on close observation. He notices, for example, the general dissatisfaction with the slaves' excessively hard labor:

. . . ils ont la pioche à la main depuis quatre heures du matin jusqu'au coucher du soleil; mais leur maître, en revenant d'examiner leur ouvrage, répète tous les soirs: "Ces gueux-là ne travaillent point"; mais ils sont esclaves, mon ami; cette idée doit bien empoisonner le maïs qu'ils dévorent et qu'ils détrempe de leur sueur.<sup>9</sup>

The Negroes' nostalgia, which was an important factor in explaining the ineptitude of the imported slaves, is touchingly described and, too, the futility of attempting escape by water to a more friendly soil:

Leur patrie est à deux cents lieues d'ici; ils s'imaginent cependant entendre le chant des coqs, et reconnaître la fumée des pipes de leurs camarades. Ils s'échappent quelquefois au nombre de douze ou quinze, enlèvent une pirogue, et s'abandonnent sur flots. Ils y laissent presque toujours la vie; et c'est peu de chose, lorsqu'on a perdu la liberté. Quelques uns cependant sont arrivés à Madagascar; mais leurs compatriotes les ont tous massacrés, disant qu'ils revenaient d'avec les blancs, et qu'ils avaient trop d'esprit.<sup>10</sup>

Parny is shocked at the callousness of the fugitive slave hunters: Aujourd'hui les colons sont en sûreté. On a détruit presque tous les *marons*; <sup>11</sup> des gens payés par la commune en font leur métier, et ils vont à la chasse des hommes aussi gaîment qu'à celle des merles.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 231.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* Two years earlier, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, whose exotic descriptions were envied by Parny, had related a similar situation in his *Voyage à l'île de France*:

les uns se pendent ou s'empoisonnent; d'autres se mettent dans une pirogue, et sans voiles, sans vivres, sans boussole, se hasardent à faire un trajet de deux cents lieues de mer pour retourner à Madagascar. On en a vu aborder; on les a repris et rendus à leurs maîtres. (Lettre XII.)

<sup>11</sup> *Maron* (modern spelling *marron*), "fugitive slave," < S. Amer. Spanish *cimarrón*.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 232. Cf. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre:

Pour l'ordinaire ils se réfugient dans les bois, où on leur donne la chasse



The brutalization and corruption of the white children on the island through their daily contacts with slaves is a noxious situation attested alike by Parny and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre.<sup>13</sup> Parny's remarks on the failure of the Christian clergy to adapt their efforts to the capacities and needs of the slave population are particularly interesting:

Ils reconnaissent un Etre suprême. On leur apprend le catéchisme; on prétend leur expliquer l'évangile; Dieu sait s'ils en comprennent le premier mot! on les baptise pourtant bon gré, malgré, après quelques jours d'instruction qui n'instruit point. J'en vis un dernièrement qu'on avait arraché de sa patrie depuis sept mois; il se laissait mourir de faim. Comme il était sur le point d'expirer, et très éloigné de la paroisse, on me pria de lui conférer le baptême. Il me regarda en souriant, et me demanda pourquoi je lui jetais de l'eau sur la tête: je lui expliquai de mon mieux la chose; mais il se retourna d'un autre côté, disant en mauvais français: Après la mort tout est fini, du moins pour nous autres Nègres; je ne veux point d'une autre vie, car peut-être y serais-je encore votre esclave.<sup>14</sup>

This anecdote may well have been suggested to Parny by the current story of the West Indian cacique, first told by Las Casas in his *Brevissima relacion de la destruccion de las Indias* (1552):

Hatuey . . . fut condamné à mourir dans le feu. On l'attache au poteau qu'entoure le bûcher; un religieux franciscain l'exhorte à se faire chrétien, et lui promet qu'il ira droit dans le ciel. Le cacique lui dit: "Quelles gens y trouve-t-on? Les chrétiens y vont-ils aussi?—Oui, répond le religieux, s'ils sont bons.—Si cela est, réplique l'Indien, je ne veux pas m'y trouver avec eux. J'aime mieux descendre dans l'enfer, pour avoir loin de moi une race si cruelle."<sup>15</sup>

The story appears also in Voltaire's *Essai sur les mœurs* (1756),<sup>16</sup> and in John Barrow's *Collection of Voyages*,<sup>17</sup> translated into French in 1766, as well as in Raynal, *Histoire des deux Indes* (1770).

avec des détachements de soldats, de nègres et de chiens; il y a des habitants qui s'en font une partie de plaisir. On les relance comme des bêtes sauvages. . . . *Loc. cit.*

<sup>13</sup> These passages have been recorded by Potez, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-91, and later in W. M. Kerby, *The Life, Diplomatic Career and Literary Activities of Nicholas Germain Léonard*, Paris, 1925, p. 330.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 232-233.

<sup>15</sup> *Œuvres de Las Casas*, ed. J. A. Llorente, Paris, 1822, I, 23.

<sup>16</sup> Chap. cxlviii, "De la conquête du Pérou." Ed. Moland, Paris, 1877-83, XII, 401-402.

<sup>17</sup> First ed. 1763. Translated title, *Abrégé chronologique ou histoire des découvertes faites par les Européens dans les différentes parties du monde* etc. The anecdote is found in the translation, II, 445.

Moreover, the response of Parny's Negro, "après la mort tout est fini," falsifies the well-known belief that the unhappy wretches will return, after death, to their native lands. An anecdote concerning this belief is found as early as 1722 in Labat's *Nouveau voyage aux îles de l'Amérique*.<sup>18</sup> Parny was not unaware of this tradition; in fact, he used it in his poem *Les Paradis*:

Un autre espoir séduit le Nègre infortuné;  
Qu'un marchand arracha des déserts de l'Afrique.  
Courbé sous un joug despotique,  
Dans un long esclavage il languit enchaîné:  
Mais quand la mort propice a fini ses misères,  
Il revole joyeux au pays de ses pères,  
Et cet heureux retour est suivi d'un repas.<sup>19</sup>

Going even farther than the numerous poets of his time who, like himself, had attacked slavery, Parny attempted to convey to his contemporaries some notion of the primitivistic poetry of the Africans. His translation of native African songs into French has aptly suggested a kinship with James Macpherson's alleged transcription of Gaelic poems;<sup>20</sup> and whether true or false to their African models, the *Chansons madécasses* (1787) were the first French venture in this realm of exotic poetry.

Dussault wrote of Parny, in 1814, as

l'écrivain qui devoit parmi nous exprimer et peindre, avec tant d'énergie et de vérité, les feux, les félicités et les tourmens de cette passion, dont les ardeurs sont plus vivement ressenties sous le ciel embrasé des tropiques.<sup>21</sup>

These qualities appear conspicuously in the *Chansons madécasses*, which were zealously admired by Parny's friend, Chateaubriand. Professor Chinard has noted that "dans la note VI du deuxième volume du *Génie du christianisme* [1st. ed. only], Chateaubriand a reproduit la douzième chanson, comme un exemple des 'chan-

<sup>18</sup> I, 446.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 29.

<sup>20</sup> The more so because the authenticity of the *Chansons madécasses* has been questioned by M. Désiré Laverdant, whom Saint-Beuve quotes as concluding that: "II [Parny] a inventé . . . les nuances de sentiment, les caractères qu'il prête à cet état de société, et jusqu'aux noms propres; c'est Parny, enfin, du sauvage très agréablement embelli." *Portraits contemporains*, Paris, 1870, IV, 448 n.

<sup>21</sup> *Annales littéraires*, Paris, 1818, IV, 391.

sons des nègres et des sauvages'";<sup>22</sup> and, furthermore, that Parny is the principal source of the African exoticism in *Les Natchez*.<sup>23</sup>

Two of the *Chansons madécasses* reflect Parny's continued interest in Negro slavery. *Chanson IX* follows:

Une mère traînait sur le rivage sa fille unique, pour la vendre aux blancs.

O ma mère! ton sein m'a portée; je suis le premier fruit de tes amours: qu'ai-je fait pour mériter l'esclavage? j'ai soulagé ta vieillesse; pour toi j'ai cultivé la terre; pour toi j'ai cueilli des fruits; pour toi j'ai fait la guerre aux poissons du fleuve; je t'ai garantie de la froidure; je t'ai portée, durant la chaleur, sous des ombrages parfumés; je veillais sur ton sommeil, et j'écartais de ton visage les insectes importuns. O ma mère, que deviendras-tu sans moi? L'argent que tu vas recevoir ne te donnera pas une autre fille; tu périras dans la misère, et ma plus grande douleur sera de ne pouvoir te secourir. O ma mère! ne vends point ta fille unique.

Prières infructueuses! Elle fut vendue, chargée de fers, conduite sur le vaisseau; et elle quitta pour jamais la chère et douce patrie.<sup>24</sup>

We may well ask whether Parny, in this *Chanson*, was not so carried away by the sentimentality of the situation that he quite overlooked its very essence. Of the many evils of slavery perhaps none was more repugnant than the selling of children by their parents.

A clearer perception of the viciousness of slavery is found in *Chanson V*, which warns the Negro in sombre terms of the white man's perfidy:

Méfiez-vous des blancs, habitants du rivage. Du tems de nos pères, des blancs descendirent dans cette île; on leur dit: Voilà des terres; que vos femmes les cultivent. Soyez justes, soyez bons, et devenez nos frères.

Les blancs promirent, et cependant ils faisaient des retranchemens. Un fort menaçant s'éleva; le tonnerre fut renfermé dans des bouches d'airain; leurs prêtres voulurent nous donner un Dieu que nous ne connaissons pas; ils parlèrent enfin d'obéissance et d'esclavage: plutôt la mort! Le carnage fut long et terrible; mais, malgré la foudre qu'ils vomissaient, et qui érasait des armées entières, ils furent tous exterminés. Méfiez-vous des blancs. etc.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Chateaubriand, *Les Natchez*, ed. Gilbert Chinard, Baltimore, 1932, p. 398n.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 69.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64. On the strength of Chateaubriand's interest in the *Chansons madécasses*, a resemblance between *Chanson IX* and the medicine man's speech before the Indian council in *Les Natchez* (*op. cit.*, p. 421) might be suggested.

This constant preoccupation with the miseries of an unfortunate race, supported by the foregoing observations, upholds the opinion of Parny's friend and biographer, Tissot, that the poet was "sensible partout aux malheurs de l'humanité."<sup>26</sup> It seems pertinent, therefore, to suggest a serious qualification of the idea that in eighteenth-century French poetry "aucune œuvre [excepting Voltaire's] ne compte dans l'histoire de la pensée."<sup>27</sup>

EDWARD D. SEEBER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

### AN UNPUBLISHED FRAGMENT OF GUI DE CAMBRAI'S *VENGEMENT ALIXANDRE*

In the Bodleian Library's *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, vol. 6, part 1, no. 31363, is listed a fragment of Gui de Cambrai's *Vengement Alixandre*, consisting of two leaves which correspond to ll. 281-482 and 959-1155 of my edition of the poem.<sup>1</sup> The fragment is on parchment and, according to the catalogue, was written about 1300. It is now listed as MS Fr. b. 1. In 1891 the two leaves formed part of a volume, listed in the catalogue as no. 31346, which contained manuscript documents chiefly of historical interest. This volume had formed part of the Lakelands Library,<sup>2</sup> and passed into the Bodleian collection through the intermediary of Mr. B. Quaritch.

To Mr. E. B. Ham, who first called my attention to the fragment, I am also indebted for a photostatic copy of the four pages, a careful transcript of the manuscript, whose bad condition necessitated the use of the ultra-violet lamp to establish several readings, and a discussion of the fragment's place in the manuscript tradition, to which I need add only additional corroborative material.

<sup>26</sup> *Œuvres complètes de Parny*, Bruxelles, 1834, I, 24.

<sup>27</sup> Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 644.

<sup>1</sup> *Elliott Monographs*, no. 23.

<sup>2</sup> The library of W. H. Crawford of Lakelands, Co. Cork, which was sold at auction in 1891 by Southeby, Wilkinson and Hodge, of London. In their catalogue the volume is listed under the number 695, "Chartae Anglo-Saxonicae et Latinae," but there is no mention of the *Vengement* fragment.

According to Mr. Ham the two leaves of the fragment measure 382 x 275 millimetres. There are two columns to the page, of 50 lines each, written in a careful hand. Since we may count 200 lines to a leaf, and since in G, the manuscript most closely resembling the fragment, there are 407 lines intervening between lines 483 and 958, it is evident that two leaves, presumably the middle folio of a signature, are missing between the two parts of our fragment. The same manuscript G has 270 lines up to the start of the first fragment. This fact suggests that, if the fragment had a similar number of lines, the *Vengement* was not the sole portion of the *Roman d'Alexandre* which it contained, for it would be unusual for a work to start on the verso of a leaf. It is certain that the fragment did not form a part of any of the extant manuscripts of the *Roman d'Alexandre*, since the number of lines to a column is greater than in any manuscript which does not at present contain the continuation either of Gui de Cambrai or of Jehan le Nevelon. It does not seem unlikely that the fragment may be a remnant of a complete and—to judge from what is preserved—carefully executed copy of the *Roman d'Alexandre*.

As far as we may judge, the fragment in its language is the product of a scribe who used the common orthography of his time but allowed a restricted number of Picard peculiarities to colour his writing. The picardisms are in general restricted to the writings *ch* before *e* and *i*: *che*, *chele*, *cheste*, etc., but also *ce*; and *c* before *a*: *camp*, *castel*, etc., but also *champ*, *chastel*, etc. There are two cases of the reduction of *-iee* to *-ie*: *drecies* (345), *enforchie* (1099). Both *fremé*, *freté*, and *fermé*, *ferté* are found. *Vo* and *vos* occur, as also *aus* < *illos*, *aront*, *merrez*, etc. The glide consonant is found in *tindrent*, *ensamble*, *membre*, although lacking in *tenrement*, *faurrons*, *vaurra*, etc. Many other dialectical characteristics are lacking or occur only sporadically. *Le* for *la* is not attested except in the dubious cases of *Egypte le grant* (960) and *quel le feron* (1015).<sup>3</sup>

*Se* for *sa* is found only once: *se prison* (1105); both *veïr* and *veoir* occur. Noteworthy peculiarities of the scribe are his writings *esmaulz*, *maulz*, *vault*, etc.; also *joedi*, and the use of *traïtres* as the oblique plural (431, 1033, 1092).

In its manuscript relations the fragment belongs to the group

\* *La part le plus haut* (982) is a barbarism due to a misreading.

which I have designated by the sign  $x'$  in my classification.<sup>4</sup> Of these five manuscripts—GIJKL—the fragment is strikingly nearest to G. In view of this agreement with a manuscript which is generally so stable an element of its group, a complete enumeration of the concordances of the fragment with the  $x'$ -group, or with the sub-groups GIL and GL, is unnecessary. The following cases are chosen from among the most prominent.

1) The fragment as a member of the  $x'$ -group includes lines 286a, 390a, 456a, 466a, 479a, 1091a, which are in  $x'$  but not in the constituted text; omits 387-8, 1127; gives the following readings: *Qui Caldee conquist* (455), *Aristotes li maistres i sermonne les gens* (471), *fors du bus departir* (1003), *Mais Perdicas l'encauche* (1010), *comme chevaliers bons* (1086).

2) The fragment as a member of the GIL-group includes line 1093a; omits 402, 420, 1002; gives the following readings: *et quar vous en hastez* (437), *Il chevauche a grant forche* (1094).

3) The fragment as a member of the GL-group omits lines 298, 375; gives the following reading: *ains que vous en partez* (1102).

4) The fragment in its connection with G omits line 332; inverts lines 301-2, 1024-5; gives the following readings: *et oys* (289), *a tant s'en sont torné* (301), *Qui fu ja cheste vile* (394), *et il soient armez* (449), *se sont rehaitié* (1032), *fait son apareillement* (1050), *A chu mot esperonne* (1111), *A terre l'ont porté* (1142).

The fairly numerous individual readings of the fragment are proof that it could not have been the direct source of G. It gives *Lascre* (327) and *Yas* (1048) for *Jasle* as in G, and departs from the readings of all other manuscripts in such cases as *est moult chascuns pensis* (287), *de grant gent si poissant* (407), *par dedens ce chalant* (417), *En Babilone* (470), *Au retraire* (974), *en la part le plus haut* (982), *Son escu li fendi* (983), *s'il l'abat ne m'en chaut* (984), *En mi lieu de l'estour* (1145).

It is also improbable that G served as direct source of the fragment, since in 1054 the fragment has preserved the reading of the  $x'$ -group while G has an individual variation: fragment and IJKL *et si home ensement*, G *o son efforcement*. Other less conclusive cases may be found in the following readings: *Por l'amour sa serour qui avoit non Biblis* (286a), *lez le port de Gangis* (291), *La gerre estoit commune et li jors biax et caus* (1067). In line 1098 the possible contamination of G from the  $x'$ -group is not echoed in the fragment, which reads with IKL.

<sup>4</sup> Elliott *Monographs*, no. 20.

Lines 1070-2 are omitted by GL but present in the fragment. Since both 1069 and 1072 commence with the word *Agolans*, the omission in GL may be due not to the absence of the lines in the original of the group but to individual carelessness. In any case the fragment gives no other indication of familiarity with more than one source.

The importance of the fragment for the establishment of the text is not great. It comports itself as a normal member of its group and sub-groups, and offers no particular problems nor solves any. It is interesting, but not overly significant, that in lines 308 and 424 the fragment has readings in common with H alone; these readings I have preserved in my text against the testimony of the other manuscripts.

BATEMAN EDWARDS

*Princeton University*

---

#### PLAYERS' QUARTOS AND DUODECIMOS OF *HAMLET*

Between 1676 and 1718 *Hamlet* was printed in quarto at least seven times. It is the version commonly known as Betterton's, for it gives the text of the play as Betterton acted it and is accompanied by a cast in which his name appears in the title rôle. The version is built on the foundation of the 1637 quarto but this has been corrected, reformed and cut. By "corrected" I mean that someone has made an effort to get rid of compositors' errors and to present the play more nearly in Shakespeare's language. But by "reformed" I mean that this corrector has felt at liberty to "improve" Shakespeare's diction where to him objectionable or uncouth words or too violent metaphors were used. These two things are not inconsistent. These changes have been investigated by Mr. Hazelton Spencer in his *Shakespeare Improved*. The cuts made use of by Betterton are indicated in his Quarto by enclosing all lines omitted by the actors in single quotes.

Mr. Spencer gives forcible reasons for his opinion, based on internal evidence, that Sir William Davenant is the person responsible for this version. This increases our interest in it, for although we must discount and regret the "reformation" of the text, yet there are instructive corrections in the edition to which Davenant's name gives weight.

About the year 1710 the separate publication in quarto of the plays of Shakespeare for acting purposes and for sale at the theater doors came to an end, and thereafter their place was taken by little stitched duodecimo volumes. Apparently the stock of *Hamlet* quartos lasted until 1718 when there appeared in duodecimo what we know as Wilks' version of *Hamlet*, for it was prepared for Robert Wilks who had succeeded Betterton in the part of Hamlet and is accompanied by a cast which includes his name. This version was prepared for Wilks by the poet John Hughes and is the version constantly referred to by Theobald in his *Shakespeare Restored* as "Mr. Hughes' *Hamlet*." It was the stage version current in London from 1718 to 1763, when it was succeeded by Garrick's first version. During this long interval it was printed no less than nineteen times.

John Hughes in preparing this version felt constrained to retain some of the unfortunate changes which had been foisted into the text of the Betterton version. Apparently they suited the taste of the times. Sometimes they made the meter more regular. The audience was accustomed to hearing the play in these words and he therefore, no doubt with regret, suffered some of these excrescences to remain. But in a large number of instances he restored the text of Shakespeare and produced a much better version than Betterton's and one which had the entire approval of so exacting a textual critic as Lewis Theobald. In this version as in the Bettertonian *Hamlet*, the actors' cuts are indicated on the margin of the verse, but the cuts used by Wilks are occasionally different from those used by Betterton.

Such has been the disrepute of these stage versions among those seriously interested in the textual criticism of Shakespeare that no very complete study seems ever to have been made of the successive reprints of these two texts. It has been supposed, and it is nearly true, that the reprints of these texts are the same as their first printing except for accumulating compositors' errors or proof-readers' corrections or miscorrections. There is, however, one printing of the Bettertonian quarto dated 1683 which is in a class by itself, and there is also a duodecimo printing for stage purposes in 1743 of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* by Lewis Theobald, in which he has similarly marked the actors' cuts, and it is to these two editions that I wish to call attention. For reasons which will appear later the second mentioned will be taken up first.



*Theobald's Stage Edition of 1743*

This is a rare little book. It is not mentioned in any of the bibliographies and I know of no copies except two in the Folger Shakespeare Library, where I only recently met with them.

In 1728 had appeared Pope's second edition of the plays of Shakespeare, printed in duodecimo, each play provided with a plate and a half-title so that in addition to the sale of the collected edition, separate plays could be and were stitched up and supplied at the theater in this form. On the back of the title page of *Hamlet* in this edition, at the foot of the *Dramatis Personae*, is the following:

Scene Elsinoor:

This story was not invented by our author;  
though from whence he took it, I know not.

This was an extraordinary confession of ignorance coming from Alexander Pope.

On March 14, 1729/30, Lewis Theobald in a letter to Warburton comments on Pope's ignorance as thus displayed and adds, "The story is extracted from Saxo Grammaticus' *Danica Historia*," and he gives the story in detail (Nichols III., II, 557); so when Theobald came to publish his own edition of Shakespeare in 1733 he inserted (VII, 225) at the beginning of *Hamlet* a note in which he says, "The story is taken from Saxo Grammaticus in his Danish History." Theobald's Shakespeare was reprinted in 1740 in small duodecimo form, the text as in the original edition but with the notes much condensed. Unfortunately Theobald's note as to the source of the Hamlet story was omitted, perhaps by mistake, for he had reason to be proud of his first publication of this fact.

This brings us to the year 1743, in which the supply of the stage version in duodecimo was quickly exhausted by reason of the extraordinary popularity of Garrick's *Hamlet* which had first appeared at Drury Lane on November 16, 1742, with Garrick as Hamlet, Mrs. Pritchard as the Queen, Kitty Clive as Ophelia, and Macklin as the First Grave Digger. What a cast! No wonder that the public flocked to these performances and that the supply of the book of the play ran out. Lewis Theobald was now ill and in great poverty. He died September 18, 1744. He seems to have induced a printer to reprint the play of *Hamlet* from his own edi-

tion in duodecimo without any notes but with the stage cuts marked in the margin as had so long been customary in the printing of the stage versions of the play. This gave a better text which, nevertheless, could be sold as a stage edition. The title page reads: "Hamlet Prince of Denmark. A Tragedy. By William Shakespear. Collated with the best Editions. London: Printed for the Company of Stationers 1743." Although Theobald in the copy he prepared for this venture struck out his notes and contented himself with marking cuts, he could not refrain from inserting a single note. At the foot of the page which carries the *Dramatis Personae*, in the exact place where Pope had exposed his ignorance as to the origin of the play, Theobald printed:

"The story taken from Saxo Grammaticus's  
Danish History.

"Note—By the directions of Sir William  
Davenant, Mr. Dryden and others the lines marked  
thus ' are generally left out in the representation."

It is in this note, and certain inferences from it, that the value of this little edition lies. We had been afforded no assurance that either Davenant or Dryden had to do with the preparation of the stage texts of *Hamlet*, until Mr. Spencer recently advanced with persuasive reasoning the conjecture that Davenant was responsible for the Bettertonian text. I think it may fairly be said that this note by Lewis Theobald advances that conjecture almost to the point of certitude. It is refreshing to find the conjectures of Shakespearean students thus unexpectedly verified.

But what had Dryden to do with the text of *Hamlet*? I will here venture another conjecture which I hope may some day be as completely verified as that concerning Sir William Davenant. Sir William died in 1668. He was the manager or proprietor of the Duke's Company, of which Thomas Betterton was the principal actor. It is, I think, not to be doubted that he consulted with Betterton as to what cuts were proper to be marked, and that in this way the prompt copy for the Duke's Theater was prepared, although it was first printed in 1676, eight years after Davenant's death.

The union of the companies in 1682 brought John Dryden, whose contract was with the King's Company, into closer relations with Thomas Betterton, who added to his fame by taking

the leading parts in Dryden's tragedies. We know that the two were often closely associated, and Lewis Theobald in the note previously quoted indicates that Dryden also had some part in the Bettertonian *Hamlet*.

*The Bettertonian Text of 1683*

In 1683 was printed in quarto: "The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark. As it is now Acted at his Highness the Duke of York's Theatre. By William Shakespeare. London: Printed for H. Herringman and R. Bentley, at the Blew Anchor in the New Exchange, and in Russell Street in Covent garden. 1683."

This seems to have been printed by the same printer as the preceding quarto, which it very much resembles in outward appearance. But collation of the two texts shows that the 1683 quarto is not a mere reprint of that of 1676. The printer has had before him a copy of the 1676 quarto in which someone has entered a number of corrections taken from a first folio of Shakespeare. The selection exercised by the corrector is notable. He did not disturb what I have previously called the "reformed" passages, but he knew that the stage text had come down from the old quarto and he knew that there are places where a better reading is supplied by the folio text. And of the three folios which he might have consulted he chose the first. A longer list of these corrections might be given. The following is a representative selection.

	<i>Q readings carried into Q 1676 and continued Q 1695 and Q 1703</i>	<i>F<sup>1</sup> readings brought into Q 1683</i>
I, I, 63	sleaded Pollax	sledded Poll-ax
I, II, 77	cloke could smother	Cloke (good Mother)
I, III, 76	love oft loses	Lone oft loses
I, V, 55	So but though to a radiant angle	So lust though to a radiant Angel
II, II, 465	affection	affectation
II, II, 473	'tis not it	'tis not so; it
II, II, 496	falls.	falls. Then senseless Illium
II, II, 525	mobled	innobled
II, II, 580	wand	warm'd

III, II, 288	with provincial	with two Provincial
III, III, 22	boistrous rain	boistrous Ruin
III, III, 58	shew by justice	shove by Justice
IV, VII, 85	they can well	they ran well
IV, VII, 172	our culcold maids	our cold maids
IV, VII, 178	old lauds	old tunes
V, I, 9	be so offended	be <i>se offendendo</i>
V, I, 96	Lady worms Choples	Lady worms; Chapless
V, I, 114	(omits the line)	Is this the Fine of, &c.
V, I, 116	will vouchers	will his vouchers
V, II, 143	you are ignorant of	you are not ignorant of

The corrector was also careful to produce a text arrangement which would help the actor. In the 1676 printing of Betterton's quarto, lines 111-112 of II, ii, are printed so as to confuse Ophelia's letter with Polonius' comments. The corrector rearranged the lines and put the comments in brackets. He throughout changes "Gertrard" to "Gertrude." At II, ii, 496 he supplies a half line, and at V, i, 114 he supplies a whole line which had dropped out. The changes made I, iii, 76 and II, ii, 525 prove that the folio used was the first folio.

Who made these corrections? It might have been Betterton himself; but had this been so he would have perpetuated them in later printings of his quartos, and this he did not do. In the light of Theobald's declaration, the judgment which the corrector used, and remembering that in 1682 the King's Company for the first time acquired the right to present *Hamlet* and that in 1695 they lost it, I am strongly inclined to attribute the editorial work seen in the 1683 quarto of *Hamlet* to John Dryden. This will repay examination, and future critics preparing texts of *Hamlet*, and faced with the often difficult choice between the quarto and the folio reading, may find assistance in knowing what was John Dryden's choice in this matter.

As has already been stated, Betterton's quarto was printed a number of times. Two different printings occur both of which are dated 1676. Under date of 1695 there are two different title pages but the printing is the same. Under date of 1703 there are three distinct printings. The first is the so-called "Bornardo" edition; the other two read "Barnardo." Although these three printings all bear the same year date, I think this is because when reprinting was needed someone handed the book to the printer only

instructing him to print it over again, and the printer obeyed his instructions literally even as to imprint and date, notwithstanding that a later date would have been in order. I have observed this phenomenon in other quarto editions, and suspect that the three quartos dated 1703 should be assigned to successive dates to fill up the gap until Wilks' *Hamlet* appeared in 1718.

But none of these later Betterton quartos follow any of the corrections of 1683. They are successive reprintings of the original quarto of 1676. The reason for this may be that Dryden's revision was looked upon as the property of the King's Theater in Drury Lane, and so when the Players, headed by Betterton, seceded in 1695 and set up a second house in Lincoln's Inn Fields they were compelled to reprint their book from the old prompt copy which they had used before the union. At any rate they did so, and Dryden's changes have never appeared in any other text.

Those interested in the stage history of *Hamlet* may be glad to have their attention drawn to the fact that in the Folger Library, in addition to two other copies of this 1683 quarto of *Hamlet*, there is a third copy, formerly the property of Mr. Halliwell-Phillips, in which he has noted on the the fly leaf "A curious old prompt copy." It is worth careful study by someone. It shows further cuts and some manuscript additions entered in a 17th century hand. For example:

"caviary to the general" is changed to "caviary to the multitude"

"we'll hear a play" to "we'll have a play"

"wezel" becomes "ousel"

"pace of practice" becomes "pass of practice"

And as showing that in Betterton's time the Ghost in the closet scene came up through the floor there occurs the entry at the proper place "Ghost at great trap" and later "Ring Ghost up." This has every appearance of being the prompt book for *Hamlet* of the King's Company during the years 1682-95, when they had the right to present this play.

HENRY N. PAUL

*Philadelphia*

---

# ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN THE GRIGGS FACSIMILE OF THE SECOND QUARTO OF *HAMLET*

Shakespearian scholars today pretty generally agree that the Second Quarto of *Hamlet* (1604) presents, in spite of numerous misprints and some omissions, the text of Shakespeare's masterpiece as Shakespeare wrote it, "according to the true and perfect Coppie." Specimens of this edition are excessively rare. Miss Bartlett (*A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*, 1916) lists only three, all at present in the United States: one in the Huntington Library, one in the Folger collection, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington, and one in the Elizabethan Club at Yale University. I shall hereafter designate these copies by the symbols H., F., and E. C. respectively.

Scholars unable to consult any of these copies at first hand have been forced to rely on the Griggs facsimile in photo-lithography, published in 1880 under the supervision of Dr. Furnivall. This facsimile was made from the Duke of Devonshire's copy of Q2, i. e. the copy now in the Huntington Library. As Furnivall noted in his Forewords, this copy like the other Kemble Quartos in the Duke's collection had its pages cut down and mounted, "which accounts for the loss of some headlines, catch-words and signatures." Fortunately, however, the text itself remains unimpaired. Viator's useful reprint of the parallel texts of *Hamlet* (Q1, Q2, and F, 1891, revised edition 1913) is based for the Q2 text on Griggs' facsimile and has therefore no independent value; it reproduces the errors of the facsimile and adds, in both editions, some of its own.

It has been my good fortune, by the generosity of the Huntington and Folger Libraries and the Elizabethan Club, to obtain recently photo-static reproductions of the three copies of Q2 now in this country. I have submitted these to a careful collation with each other and with the facsimile, and have found that with two exceptions, to be hereafter noted, the photo-stats agree with each other in every case, even in the smallest details of punctuation. There are no variants due to proof correction while the book was passing through the press such as one often finds in Elizabethan quartos, notably in the first quarto of *Lear*. On the other hand, the Griggs facsimile differs again and again from the text of the photo-

stats, as a rule in minor matters of punctuation, but occasionally in alteration of letters and omission of words which affect the text. I have noted all these, and for the benefit of scholars and libraries depending upon the facsimile or Vietor for the true text of Q2, I subjoin here a list of these differences. I cite by the page number of the facsimile and the act, scene, and line number of the Globe edition printed in the margin of Griggs.

P. 19 (1, 4, 51). Griggs has a period after *again*. All three photo-stats have a question mark more or less broken as is often the case with the type used for this edition. The B. M. Q2 (1605) also has the question mark here.

P. 20 (1, 4, 68). Griggs *flood my*, followed by a faint mark which may represent an imperfect comma. Here Griggs reproduces H. exactly and E. C. agrees with H. F., however, contains the missing and necessary word *Lord* after *my*. The careful textual notes of the Cambridge edition (V. 7, p. 418) state that *Lord* is omitted in Q2; but the appearance of the word in F. shows that this was not the case in all copies of Q2. Moreover since this word appears in the B. M. Q2 (1605) and in all the later Qq now in the Folger Library, as I am informed by Professor Adams, it would seem that the original copy of Q2 from which these were successively set up must have been one which like F. contained the word *Lord*.

A careful examination of the photo-stats at this point goes to show that we have to do here not with a proof-reader's correction, supplying the missing word in later copies as the sheets were being struck off, but with a mere failure on the printer's part to ink his form properly. L. 68 is a very long line; the word *Lord* projects far toward the right hand margin of the page and might easily have been missed when the form was re-inked. The same cause accounts for the absence in H. and E. C. of the final *e* and the period in 1, 5, 7.—see the next note.

P. 21 (1, 5, 7). Griggs *shalt hear*, reproducing H. which here, as in the preceding case, agrees with E. C. But F. has *shalt heare*., presenting the final *e* and the period wanting in the other two photo-stats. This line is number 4 from the top of D2 verso in the Q, corresponding in position with 1, 4, 68, which is 4 from the top of D2 recto. Like the former line, the present is an unusually long one and the absence of the final *e* and the period in H. and E. C. may be ascribed to a failure in inking.

P. 28 (2, 1, 81). Here at the end of the line Griggs has a blurred point that more closely resembles a period than a comma. Vietor evidently took it as a period since he reproduces it as such in both his editions. But all three photo-stats have a comma which is what the text demands.

P. 33 (2, 2, 155). Here Griggs reads *know* with no punctuation mark following. All three photo-stats show a period. It is perhaps plainer in E. C. than in the others, but unmistakable in all.

P. 36 (2, 2, 320). Here Griggs has *Aunimales*. The three photo-stats *Annimales*. The *n*'s in H. are not well inked, but the first is clearly an *n*, not a *u*. In F. and E. C. the *n*'s are unmistakable.

P. 40 (2, 2, 525). Griggs has no period after *Queene* in Hamlet's repetition of the word. All three photo-stats have a period here.

(2, 2, 531). Griggs prints *ore teamed* as two words. All three photo-stats connect with a hyphen, *ore-teamed*.

P. 41 (2, 2, 595). Griggs prints *Iohn a dreames* as three words; the photo-stats connect by hyphens, *Iohn-a-dreames*.

P. 45 (3, 1, 120). Here we get the first evidence of a tampering with the text. Griggs reads *enoculat* in, I suspect, an attempt to correct a misprint and bring the Q text into agreement with the *textus receptus*—the Folio has correctly *innoculate*. All three photo-stats have *enocutat* or possibly *euocutat*; the second letter looks like an inverted *n*, but it is difficult to be certain. A strong magnifying glass put on the first *t* in the facsimile seems to show a prolongation of a faintly crossed *t* in such a way as to eliminate the cross and change the letter to an *l*. This must have been done in the plate from which the facsimile was printed. Cf. below note on 5, 2, 245.

P. 47 (3, 1, 192). The last word of this line in Griggs looks like *care*, and was so read by Viator who in his first edition prints *care*, later correcting to *eare*. In H. the loop of the *e* is closed, but a comparison of the letter with others in the adjacent lines shows that it is not a *c*. F. and E. C. show *e* a little more plainly. See note on 4, 5, 90 below.

P. 51 (3, 2, 162). The last word in this line in Griggs looks like *fin*g with a defective *f*. This is probably due to a blot over the letter in H. which misled the corrector of Griggs. In both F. and E. C. the letter is plainly an *r* which is what the text demands: i. e. *ring*.

(3, 2, 171). The first letter of the third word in Griggs looks like a *t*, *tourneyes*. What is wanted is an *i*. In H. the dot over the *i* is not very clear, but perceptible with a glass. In F. and E. C. it is perfectly plain.

P. 56 (3, 2, 385). Griggs has *s'hlood*; all three photo-stats the correct *s'bloud*. The *b* in H. is so plain that it cannot be mistaken for *h*. Cf. note on 5, 1, 160 below where the same mistake appears in Griggs.

P. 67 (4, 2, 11). Griggs has no punctuation after *owne*. The necessary comma is faint but visible in H., blurred in E. C., and perfectly clear in F.

P. 70 (4, 3, 4). Griggs has no punctuation after *randeuous*. All three photo-stats have a period.

P. 72 (4, 5, 29). Griggs omits the word *Song* in the right hand margin after this line. It appears in all three photo-stats. This must be due to some tampering with the plate; below after l. 38 Griggs correctly prints *Song* in the right hand margin. Did a corrector of the plate for the facsimile imagine that Ophelia had but one song here and consequently delete one of the stage directions?

P. 73 (4, 5, 69). Griggs omits the comma after *ground* which appears in all three photo-stats.

P. 74 (4, 5, 90). Griggs reads *care* at the end of this line. All three photo-stats correctly *eare*. The first *e* in H. is rather blurred, but certainly not a *c*. Cf. note on 3, 1, 192.

P. 79 (4, 7, 43). Griggs has a period after *kingdom* at the end of this



line. The photo-stats have a comma, somewhat blurred in H., but unmistakable in the others.

(4, 7, 55). Griggs has no punctuation after *Lord*; all three photo-stats have a comma.

P. 80 (4, 7, 83). Griggs has a period after *Normandy*; all three photo-stats a comma.

P. 81 (4, 7, 106). Griggs has no punctuation after *you* at the end of this line; all three photo-stats a period, a mark often used by Elizabethan printers to indicate, as here, an interrupted or unfinished speech.

(4, 7, 120). After *change* at the end of this line Griggs leaves a space and then sets a comma thus: *change,*. This may be due to the fact that the necessary *s* is in H. crowded against the preceding letter and far from clear. It is clear enough, however, to show that the true reading is *changes*, and there can be no mistake about this word in the other two photo-stats.

(4, 7, 123). Griggs reads *thrifts*, apparently in an attempt to correct a palpable misprint. All three photo-stats read *thirfts*, although it is not always easy to say whether the fifth letter is an *f* or a long *f*.

P. 84 (5, 1, 30). Griggs prints *thefelves*, omitting the macron (˘) over the first *e*, placed there by the printer of Q2 to save the space required for the letter *m* in a crowded line. All three photo-stats have this mark.

P. 85 (5, 1, 73). Griggs omits the period after *making*; it appears in all three photo-stats.

P. 86 (5, 1, 124). Griggs omits the period after *to*; it appears in all three photo-stats.

(5, 1, 160). Griggs prints *horne*; all three photo-stats correctly *borne*. Cf. note on 3, 2, 385 above.

P. 88 (5, 1, 258). The punctuation mark after *doone* in Griggs looks like a comma. It might perhaps be mistaken for a comma in H.; but in F. and E. C. it is plainly a period.

P. 90 (5, 2, 2). Griggs has a comma after *circumstance*. H. has a blurred period that might be mistaken for a comma, but F. and E. C. have clearly a period.

P. 95 (5, 2, 216). Griggs omits the word *to* before *Laertes* in this line. It appears in all three photo-stats.

(5, 2, 245). Griggs prints *fane away*. It seems evident that the plate has been touched to turn a rather faint *t* in H. into an *f* in the facsimile. It is interesting to note that Dover Wilson in his valuable discussion of the text of *Hamlet* (Cranach Press edition, Weimar, 1930) relying on the facsimile takes *fane* to be the original reading and remarks (p. 182) that "the corrector [of the press] is able to make the easy change from the nonsensical *fane* to *tane*." It is not easy to see why the miscorrector of the facsimile should have changed *tane* to the nonsensical *fane*.

THOMAS MARC PARROTT

Princeton University

## MARLOWE'S "FRENCH CROWNS"

In writing the Introduction to his new edition of *Doctor Faustus*, Professor Boas has dealt at some length with the intricate problem of the relations of the 1604 and 1616 texts. In support of his belief that the 1616 version of I, iv, is earlier than that of 1604, and that the additions to the 1604 text came from another pen than Marlowe's, he adduces a piece of evidence which it is the purpose of this paper to question.<sup>1</sup> Commenting on the Clown's use of the words "French crowns . . . English counters," Boas remarks:

Ward quotes from Harrison, *Description of England*, II, 25: "Of forren coines we have . . . finallie the French and Flemish crownes, onlie currant among vs, so long as they hold weight." Ward also points out (Introd., p. cxxxiv, note) that in 1595 England began to export largely to France, and that this commerce, together with the reimbursement of the large sums which Elizabeth had lent to Henry IV, drew a large quantity of French money to England. Hence the passage is almost certainly an interpolation after Marlowe's death.

Ward, it appears, obtained the information which Boas borrowed, from still another source. He cites the possibility that the 1604 text contains the play as it was performed from 1597 onwards "with the additions by Dekker," and the edition of 1616 "the play as it was performed from 1602 onwards with the additions by Birde and S. Rowley." In a note to this passage Ward says:

This supposition is rendered probable by the fact that a passage printed in the quartos of 1604 and 1609 is omitted in that of 1616; which passage, as has been acutely pointed out by Dr. Albers, *u. s.*, 380, seems like an addition of 1597. It is the Clown's contemptuous comparison of the value of French crowns to that of English counters (iv, 36-37). 'In the year 1595 an active and considerable commerce arose between England and France. England commenced to export a large quantity 'd'objets de première nécessité' to France, and this commerce together with the reimbursement of the large sums which Queen Elizabeth had lent to Henry IV, drew a large quantity of French money to England; but this was not the case in the days of Marlowe, and the allusion in question in his days would have been rather incomprehensible.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, edited by Frederick S. Boas, New York, 1932, Introduction, pp. 23-24 and p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> A. W. Ward, *Old English Drama*, Oxford, 1878. Introd., pp. lxxxv-lxxxvi.

It was, then, Albers who first used this passage as a test of Marlowe's authorship. He cites it as the "main reason" why he does not "hold Marlowe responsible" for the passage, and rests his case upon the condition of French finances at the time.<sup>3</sup> But the point at issue here is not whether the French money circulating in France was debased (as it no doubt was); nor is it whether there was an increased circulation of French crowns in England in 1595. The only important question is whether Christopher Marlowe's audience in 1593 or earlier would have understood clearly the Clown's reluctance to accept the money offered him (a trait rare enough in an Elizabethan clown) and would have laughed when he compared the French crowns to worthless slugs.

It is hardly necessary to point out that Shakespeare has, among a number of references to French crowns, two that should have given some pause to those who reached the conclusions just mentioned. They are *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, i, ii, 92, and *Love's Labour's Lost*, iii, i, 148. If we must date Marlowe's passage after 1595, we must also date these two plays later.

However that may be, it appears that the name French crown was familiar not only to the theatre-goers of Marlowe's day (some of whom probably had very good reason for regretting that fact) but also to Marlowe himself. An expert on English coinage is authority for the fact that the circulation of French money in England dates from the time of the English conquests there.<sup>4</sup> A glance at the *Statutes at Large* and the proclamations issued by the Crown from time to time demonstrates that the chief difficulties which the English government had to meet in effecting the desired standards of weight and fineness in its money, were connected with the circulation of foreign gold within the realm. This coin, even more so than the English coin, was counterfeited both at home and abroad; it was circulated freely and used to fleece the unwary or the ignorant. A law of 1554 gives a fairly good picture of the situation:

Forasmuch as by the Laws of this Realm small and no due and condign

---

<sup>3</sup> J. H. Albers, "On Christopher Marlowe's 'Tragical History of Doctor Faustus'", *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur*, N.F., iii, 379-380.

<sup>4</sup> Rev. Rogers Ruding, *Annals of the Coinage of Britain*, 3 vols., London, 1817, i, 192.

Punishment is at this present Time provided for such evil disposed Persons as shall counterfeit or forge such kind of Gold or Silver of other Realms, as is not the proper Coin of this Realm, and yet permitted and suffered by the Queen Our Sovereign Lady's Consent, and heretofore hath been permitted and suffered by the Consent of her Most Noble Progenitors, to be currant in Payment within this her Realm, nor for such Persons as shall counterfeit the Queen's Highness Sign Manual, or Privy Signet or Privy Seal; by reason whereof divers evil disposed Persons are encouraged and boldned daily to perpetrate and commit the said several Offences

II For Remedy whereof, be it enacted by our said Sovereign Lady the Queen, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That if any Person or Persons hereafter falsly forge and counterfeit any such Kind of Coin of Gold or Silver as is not the proper Coin of this Realm, and is or shall be currant within this Realm by the consent of the Queen, her Heirs or Successors: (2) or if any Person or Persons at any Time hereafter do falsly forge or counterfeit the Queen's Sign Manual, Privy Signet or Privy Seal; (3) that then every such Offence shall be deemed and judged High Treason. (4) And the offenders therein, their Counsellors, Procurors, Aiders and Abettors, being convict according to the laws of this Realm of any of the said Offences, shall likewise be deemed and adjudged Traitors against the Queen, her Heirs and Successors, and the Realm, and shall suffer and have such Pains of Death, Forfeiture of Lands, Goods and Chattels, and also lose the Privilege of all Sanctuary, as in the case of High Treason is used and ordained.<sup>5</sup>

Similar laws providing punishment for counterfeiters are scattered throughout the statutes of the sixteenth century. They are directed not only against counterfeiters of British money but also against the debasers and counterfeiters of foreign money, whether the latter was current within the kingdom or not.<sup>6</sup> The French crown was one of the foreign coins current in England. As early as May 25, 1522, the "crown soleil" (French crown) was given a current value of 4s. 4d.<sup>7</sup> A proclamation dated March 8, 1554 allowed "French crowns of the sun to pass at 6s. 4d."<sup>8</sup> It also stated that when such coins were of standard fineness they might be paid in or out of the Exchequer. A proclamation of October 9, 1560, determined that "the gold Burgundian, Kaisars, or French

<sup>5</sup> 1 Mary, Sess. ii, Ch. vi.

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, 1 and 2 Phillip and Mary, Ch. xi; 4 Elizabeth, Ch. iii; and 18 Elizabeth, Ch. i.

<sup>7</sup> *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations*, calendared by Robert Steele, Oxford, 1910, No. 82.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 448.

Crowns hitherto current at 6s. 4d." were to be current at 6s., and "the gold Pistolettes valued at 6s. 2d." were to be current at 5s. 10d.<sup>9</sup> Very soon after this, March 13, 1561/2, the value of French and Burgundian crowns was reduced from 6s. to 4s.<sup>10</sup> This fact is good evidence that the vast majority of French crowns circulating in England at that time were inferior, since such reductions in value were made in order to compensate for debasement.<sup>11</sup> However, a more significant circumstance is made known by a proclamation of November 15, 1561, which contained cuts of six coins, including a French crown.<sup>12</sup> This was done so that the general public might, when the proclamation was posted, have ample opportunity to familiarize itself with the appearance of the genuine coin, and thus to arm itself against deception by spurious imitations. In the year 1587 (October 12)

a Proclamation was issued, for reforming the deceits in diminishing the value of Coins of Gold current within the Queen's Majesty's Dominions, and for remedying the losses that might grow by receiving thereof, being diminished. From which it appears that English Gold Coins, and also foreign Money current in the Realm were exported into foreign countries, and there diminished; and that it was afterwards returned, and paid in lieu of lawful Money. Others of them were embased, by clipping, sawthering, or other unlawful practices, of their due fineness; and many were counterfeited abroad.<sup>13</sup>

The same proclamation provided that "all persons to whom such Coins should be offered, were authorized not only to refuse them, but also to strike a hole at their pleasure in every such piece. . . ." <sup>14</sup> Of this latter authorization Marlowe's clown does not seem to have availed himself, unless he wishes to imply, by referring to the *guilders* as *gridirons*, that they are already struck through. Finally, it may be noted that the French crown was one of the coins referred to above by Ruding as "foreign Money," for it was included in the list of abatements for that year.<sup>15</sup>

With these things in mind it is hard to think that Marlowe's audience would have failed to get the Clown's point in referring to French crowns as being of no more value than English counters. It is not difficult to believe, on the other hand, that there were

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 530.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 559.

<sup>11</sup> Ruding, *op. cit.*, II, 135.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 556.

<sup>13</sup> Ruding, *op. cit.*, II, 171-2.

<sup>14</sup> Ruding, *ibid.*, II, 172.

<sup>15</sup> Ruding, *ibid.*, II, 173.

many in the audience who had been so unwise as to accept just such French crowns as the fool pretended to reject. And especially would this be true of those in the pit, from which the unlearned gaped up at the actors, and for whose entertainment in particular these lines were written.

Moreover, there is also reason to believe that Marlowe himself had in mind when he wrote these lines something more serious and important than the playful quip of the Clown, for if there is any truth in what the infamous Richard Baines had to bequeath to posterity, the dramatist had boasted

That he had as good Right to Coine as the Queen of England, and that he was acquainted with one Poole a prisoner in Newgate who hath greate Skill in mixture of mettals and hauing learned some thinges of him he ment through help of a Cunninge stamp maker to Coin french Crownes pistoletes and English shillinges.<sup>16</sup>

H. EDWARD CAIN

*Catholic University of America*

---

#### A SOURCE FOR *CAMBISES*

The popularity of Thomas Preston's *Cambises* as a genre play has effected its inclusion in almost every anthology of pre-Shakespearean drama and its mention in every treatise on the Elizabethan stage. Apparently, however, its source has never been noticed, and this undoubtedly accounts for the tendency on the part of some commentators to attribute some of the scenes of violence in the play to the state of the early sixteenth-century stage rather than to the work from which Preston took his material. Perhaps the very obviousness of the source has precluded previous commentators from mentioning it. The two main classical sources for information concerning the *gests* of Cambyases are Herodotus and Athenaeus, and both of these writers were available to men of the Renaissance. There is no evidence in *Cambises* that Preston went to Athenaeus, but all of the events that he mentions can be found in Herodotus's lengthy account of Cambyases. In

<sup>16</sup> *The Life of Marlowe and The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage*, C. F. Tucker Brooke, New York, 1930, p. 99. Professor Brooke also points out that Baines' charges were drawn up when he supposed Marlowe to be still alive. See *ibid.*, pp. 67-8.

spite of this fact, there is strong evidence in Preston's play that he did not go to this obvious source, but found his material in a contemporary historical work.

There are eight historical events in the life of Cambyses that are narrated by Preston: (1) the conviction of Sisamnes for bribetaking, his execution, the flaying of his body, and the appointment of his son, Otian, as his successor;<sup>1</sup> (2) Praxaspes's reproof of Cambises for drinking;<sup>2</sup> (3) Croesus's jest on the superiority of Cyrus to Cambises;<sup>3</sup> (4) the shooting by Cambises of the son of Praxaspes;<sup>4</sup> (5) the murder of Smirdis;<sup>5</sup> (6) Cambises's passion for his "cosin-jarmin";<sup>6</sup> (7) the conflict between the two young dogs and the lion's whelp, the Queen's interpretation of the combat, Cambises's rage, and the subsequent murder of the Queen;<sup>7</sup> (8) the manner in which Cambises dies.<sup>8</sup>

By all appearances, Preston could have garnered all of his historical incidents from Herodotus; however, there are some striking objections to this thesis: (1) Preston as a moralist assumes that all of Cambises's deeds are the result of drink and an evil nature; Herodotus assures his readers regularly that they were the result of insanity: (2) Herodotus gives many other incidents that Preston could have used to advantage; under these circumstances, why did Preston use just these eight events?: (3) Herodotus writes that after the death of Cambyses the usurping magus completed the remaining seven months of Cambyses's eighth year;<sup>9</sup> Preston writes in his prologue, "To bring to end with shame his race—two yeares he did not reign";<sup>10</sup> (4) In Herodotus, Cambyses rises from the table and shoots Praxaspes's son; in *Cambises*, he calls for several more bumpers of wine before he commits

<sup>1</sup> T. Preston, "A Lamentable Tragedie of Cambises King of Percia", lines 353-474, J. M. Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shakespearian Drama* (1897), II: Herodotus, v, 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, 478-496: Herodotus, III, 34.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 497-505: Herodotus, III, 34.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, 506-568: Herodotus, III, 35.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, 622-731: Herodotus, III, 30.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, 881-936: Herodotus, III, 31.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1020-1132: Herodotus, III, 32.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1159-1168: Herodotus, III, 64.

<sup>9</sup> Herodotus, III, 67.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, 33.

the murder: (5) In Herodotus, Praxaspes is forced to compliment Cambyses after the shooting and to become the official assassin of Smirdis; in Preston's play, Praxaspes disappears after the shooting and Smirdis is slain by Cruelty and Murder: (6) In Herodotus, there are two versions of the murder of the Queen: she is slain at Cambyses's command; she is kicked to death by Cambyses; Preston selects the former method which is certainly less illustrative of Cambyses's cruelty. These objections would not seem serious if there were not a contemporary source that better suited the play formula.

To the men of the Renaissance, Cambyses was not insane but cruel. Compendiums like that of Textor<sup>11</sup> always include him among the vicious. The historians of the time, who were intent in showing the hand of God in the affairs of history, took the same point of view. Carion, the author of a handy pocket-history of the world, published in 1550, devotes five pages to the career of Cambyses and considers him not mad but bad. He pauses in his account of the career of Cambyses to make occasional preachments, as "*At tales mores non diu successum habere potuerunt. Loquitur enim Deus in scriptura. Viri sanguinum et dolosi non dimidiabunt dies suos in terra.*"<sup>12</sup> Carion sets the non-Herodotian temper for Preston's *Cambises*; he also provided the events. Carion gives exactly eight illustrations of the life of Cambyses and they are the same eight that Preston uses. There was no need to select from the wealth of Herodotus. Carion also provided the non-Herodotian account of the length of Cambyses reign when he wrote, "*Deum non ferre diu tyrannos. Nam non longe post mortem Cyri supra unius anni spacium vixit Cambises.*"<sup>13</sup> In Preston's play *Cambises*, as has been mentioned, calls for more drink before he shoots Praxaspes's son, an incident not recorded by Herodotus; however, in Carion the deed is done "*cum maxime poteret.*"<sup>14</sup> In Carion's account the compliment of Praxaspes is wanting and the courtier disappears after his son is murdered so that he does not participate in the slaying of Smirdis whom Cambyses "*necari clam iussit.*"<sup>15</sup> These incidents vary from Herodotus but are common to Preston and Carion. Carion gives just

<sup>11</sup> J. R. Textor, *Officina* (1562), II, 161r.

<sup>12</sup> J. Carion, *Chronicorum libri tres* (Frankfort, 1550), p. 49v.

<sup>13</sup> *Op cit.*, loc. cit.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 48v.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 49r.



one account of the death of the Queen, the tame account that Preston uses; he also calls her the "sororem-germanam," which is closer to Preston's "cosin-jarmin" than Herodotus's "full sister." In this connection, also, Carion writes, "*cum tamen ab hoc genere contrahendi matrimonii natura abhorreat*,"<sup>16</sup> a trite statement, but especially interesting when read in connection with Preston's, "It is a thing that Natures course doth utterly detest."<sup>17</sup> Finally, the speculations, trial, and punishment of Sisamnes are given special treatment by Carion in a chapter titled "*De supplicio iniqui Iudicis*,"<sup>18</sup> which is appended to his general discussion of Cambyses.

Now it is highly possible that Preston did not use Carion at all but some work from which Carion derived or some work that derived from Carion; however, this much is true; Preston like many of his fellows obviously preferred a contemporary short-cut to learning to the great classics of antiquity.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

State College of Washington

---

SPENSER'S *SHAMEFASTNESSE, FAERIE QUEENE*,  
II, ix, 40-44

The account of Guyon's meeting with the personified abstraction, Shamefastnesse, has received little notice from the commentators. Todd<sup>1</sup> gives some interesting literary references to shamefacedness. Miss Winstanley<sup>2</sup> suggests that it represents the Aristotelian *αἰδώς*. Mrs. Hulbert<sup>3</sup> points out the appropriateness of the meeting of the two, since shamefacedness is an integral part of temperance. My purpose is to consider the relation to Aristotle a little more fully and then to relate Spenser's concept to the contemporary ideal.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 49r.

<sup>17</sup> *Op. cit.*, 910.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 49v-50r.

<sup>1</sup> IV, 70; V, 421. These references may be considered supplementary to those given below.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Bk. II, Cambridge, 1924, p. lxvi.

<sup>3</sup> *SP.*, April, 1931.

When Sir Guyon comes to the Castle of Alma he is entertained by a lady

That was right faire, and modest of demaine,  
But that too oft she chaung'd her native hew.

She kept her eyes on the ground while they "commoned" and blushed continually.

Great wonder had the knight, to see the mayd  
So straungely passioned.

He inquired if he had been too bold or if she was troubled by some other cause.

She answerd nought, but more abasht for shame,  
Held downe her head, the whiles her louely face  
The flashing bloud with blushing did inflame,  
And the strong passion mard her modest grace.

Finally Alma explains to him:

She is the fountaine of your modestie:  
You shamefast are, but *Shamefastnesse* it self is shee.

In Bk. iv, x, 50, the character appears again and is described in much the same manner. She is placed next to *Womanhood* in the Temple of Venus, where with eyes cast down she sat,

Ne euer durst her eyes from ground vpreare,  
Ne euer once did looke up from her desse,  
As if some blame of euill she did feare. . .

One of the other figures in the group is "*sober Modestie*."

The following points should be noted in Spenser's concept: first, he characterizes Shamefastnesse as moved by strong *passion*: she is so "straungely passioned" that Guyon is amazed; second, this passion represents an *extreme state*: it mars her "modest grace" and is definitely a fault; third, it is somewhat distinguished from modesty; fourth, it is the result of the fear of "some blame of evil"; finally, it has a general connection with the knight of temperance before he undertakes his last adventure against the forces of sensuality, or incontinence. Its place in the Temple of Venus also implies a connection with sex.

Miss Winstanley has pointed out a general parallel between Spenser's Shamefastnesse and Aristotle's *αἰδώς* but she hardly gets

beyond the fact that they both mean bashfulness.<sup>4</sup> A fuller analysis of Aristotle's concept shows certain fundamental differences. The following points should be compared to the above analysis: first, Aristotle says that it is a passion (*πάθος*) (ii, 7.), a bodily condition said to be characteristic rather of a state of feeling than of a state of character (iv, 9.); second, it is a *mean state* between the extremes of shamelessness (*ἀναισχυντία*) and of consternation or utter confusion (*κατάπλησις*); third, he does not appear to make any clear-cut distinctions between modesty and shamefacedness;<sup>5</sup> fourth, it is defined as a kind of fear of dishonor, but he emphasizes the fact that the sense of shame is not characteristic of a good man because it results from bad actions: it is to be considered good only conditionally, if a good man errs he will feel shame; finally, though he discusses it in the sections devoted to what practically amounts to continence, he does not link the two but leaves it simply as the general fear of dishonor.

The second and third points seem to be the main difference between the two concepts. As the third depends on the second it is not necessary to consider it here. Spenser's idea of modesty is similar to Aristotle's shamefacedness but his concept of shamefacedness itself represents one of the Aristotelian *extremes*. The personified abstraction is overwhelmed with shame from the very beginning. Her confusion mars her modesty. Her actions are not temperate; her feelings run away with her. Everywhere else in this book Spenser emphasizes the mean and the rule of reason over the passions. Here there can be no doubt that he represents an extreme: the lady is even incapacitated from performing her courtly duties to Guyon. Aristotle begins his remarks on the subject: "There are also means in the passions and concerned with the passions."<sup>6</sup> Spenser, it is clear, has conceived the passion in a

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Bk. II, pp. lxvi-lxvii. (The reference to the *Nic. Ethics* is misprinted IV, xv, for IV, ix.)

<sup>5</sup> In the *Eth. Eud.* (iii, 7.) shamefacedness (*αἰδώς*) is considered the physical basis for temperance (*σωφροσύνη*). Cf. J. A. Stewart, *Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics*, I, 213. St. Thomas defines shamefacedness almost exactly as Aristotle, but he discusses modesty separately. Temperance is the moderation of the stronger passions, the concupiscence of the pleasures of touch; modesty is the moderation of the weaker passions, of matters of lesser moment. (*Summa*, Quest. 160.)

<sup>6</sup> *Eth. Nic.*, ii, 7, 1108.<sup>a</sup> (Transl. Ross, Oxford, 1925.)

fundamentally different way. He makes no attempt to portray a mean but takes the literary advantage of the extreme. As this is totally out of keeping with the principle so carefully laid down in the *Ethics* the logical conclusion seems to be that Spenser was not using Aristotle as a source.<sup>7</sup>

It is not necessary to look for a source for Spenser's idea, it was part of his literary and ethical inheritance.<sup>8</sup> The Elizabethans seem to have made a slight distinction between modesty and shamefacedness but it was sometimes lost. There appear to have been two aspects of shamefacedness and Guyon represents them both: (1) the particular application to matters of sex which often shaded into (2) the general concept as applied to all behavior. In Stephen Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure*, Shamefastness, the jailer in the house of Correction, guards those who have sinned by seducing women.<sup>9</sup> A great many of Guyon's adventures might be considered illustrations of the following passage from Elyot's *Governour* (1531): "Shamefastness ioyned to *Appetite of generation* maketh *Continence*, which is the mean betwene *Chastitie* and *inordinate luste*."<sup>10</sup> In December, 1596, Lady Bacon wrote to the Earl of Essex and took him to task about a rumored intrigue with one of the court ladies. She describes the lady in question as "utterly condemned as too bad, both unchaste and impudent, with, as it were, an incorrigible unshamefacedness."<sup>11</sup> Golding's translation of Hurault's *Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses* (1595) enumerates the "ornaments of a good woman" as "meeldness, shamefastnesse, and chastitie."<sup>12</sup> Elizabeth assumed the virtue along with the other "ornaments of a good woman" and used it for political purposes in her international relations. According to Camden she made it an excuse to delay the marriage negotiations with Philip of Spain:

<sup>7</sup> Since Mrs. Hulbert has already shown conclusively that the virtue of temperance in Bk. II is *not* "as Aristotle hath devised" this conclusion might almost be expected. See *SP.*, Apr., 1931.

<sup>8</sup> For further references see *NED.*, and *I Tim.* 2. 9. Also note 1 above.

<sup>9</sup> Percy Society, XVIII, 159.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Croft, London, 1883, I, 238. (A great deal of Spenser's theory of love might also be related to this idea.)

<sup>11</sup> W. B. Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex*, London, 1853, I, 406.

<sup>12</sup> P. 332. (In Bk. IV Spenser places *Shamefastnesse* next to *Womanhood* in the Temple of Venus, as I have already pointed out.)

Her Suitor therefore King *Philip* she putteth off by little and little, with a modest answer, and honest and maidenly shamefac'dness, but in very deed out of scruple of Conscience.<sup>13</sup>

Thomas Wilson, in his *Arts of Rhetoricque* (1560) used it to define modesty; "Modestie, is an honest shamefastnesse whereby we keepe a constant looke, & appeare sober in all our outward doings."<sup>14</sup> Closer to Spenser himself is a letter written by Sir Henry Sidney to his son, Sir Philip Sidney, giving him a list of rules from which to frame his conduct. Number eleven runs:

Be modest in each assembly, and rather be rebuffed of light fellows for a maiden shamefacedness, than of your sober friends for pert boldness.<sup>15</sup>

It should be noted that most of these references come from life, not literature. They are from widely different sources, including the Spenser circle itself. Spenser probably absorbed the idea long before he heard of Aristotle. It may easily have been part of his home teaching. His conception of the passion as an extreme in itself is of a *popular* nature. Aristotle handles it with more subtlety and makes it a mean passion between two extremes. If Spenser had done the same it would have been more in keeping with the rest of Book II. Instead of that he makes Guyon's modesty the result of a touch of shamefacedness in his character. The result is the same as Aristotle's mean, but the underlying idea is entirely different.

KERBY NEILL

Baltimore

"OCCASION," *FAERIE QUEENE* II. iv. 4-5

Spenser's conception of Occasion is usually traced to classic sources. Jortin suggests Phaedrus 5. 8, the twelfth epigram of Ausonius, and the Greek *Anthology*; to these Kitchin adds Dionysius Cato's *Distichs*, No. 17. A much more immediate source is the contemporary emblem books. Spenser's interest in these books is a safe assumption, if only because of the presence of his "Epigrams" and "Sonets" in Van der Noodt's *Theatre of Voluptuous*

<sup>13</sup> *History of Elizabeth*, 4th edit., 1688, p. 15.

<sup>14</sup> Ed. Geo. H. Mair, Oxford, 1909, p. 31.

<sup>15</sup> *Harl. Misc.*, I, 380.

*Worldlings* (1569). Many collections of emblems treat of Occasion, but I shall list only a few: William de la Perriere, *Theatre des Bons Engins* (Paris, 1539);<sup>1</sup> Giles Corrozet, *Hecatomgraphie* (Paris, 1540, Emblems 41 and 84);<sup>1</sup> Andrea Alciati, *Viri Clarissimi* (Augsburg, 1531, sig. [A 8 recto and verso]); Alciati, *Emblematum Libellus* (Paris, 1534, sig. B ii<sup>v</sup>); Alciati, *Emblemata* (Lyons, 1551, sig. I 3); Alciati, *Emblemata* (Frankfort, 1583, Emblem 185—the figure of Occasion is used with variations on title-page and in the colophon); and Geoffrey Whitney, *A Choice of Emblems and Other Devices* (1586, p. 181). Green (*op. cit.*, pp. 264-5) mentions Johann David's *Occasio Arrepta Neglecta* (Antwerp, 1605), with twelve illustrative plates by Theodore Galle. The emblem books usually reprint and translate the poem from the *Anthology* and illustrate it with the figure of a young, vigorous woman with winged feet (or standing on fortune's wheel or on a ball and a dolphin). Her head is bald save for a long forelock, and in her hand she usually holds a razor. She represents the mutability of occasion in general. Spenser retains only one feature of this deity, the forelock on a bald head, intended to symbolize the elusiveness of fortune. His goddess, as Kitchin points out, is a different sort of creature. She is Occasion for Wrath, and her nature is revealed by her filthy raiment, her wrinkled age, her feeble steps, and her lameness.

The figures of Discord and Envy in the emblem books may have suggested some of the details in Spenser's description that are not found in the sources mentioned. "Invidia" in Alciati's *Emblemata* (Lyons, 1551, sig. [E 8]) is a loathsome hag with viperous tongue (cf. *F. Q.* I. iv. 30. 3 and V. xii. 30. 5-7) and pendulous breasts, who supports herself with a staff. The figure appears again in his *Emblematum Libellus* (Venice, 1546, sig. E iii<sup>v</sup>) and in *Emblemata* (Paris, 1584, No. 71), and two others much like it are to be found in J. Baudoin's *Recueil d'Emblemes Divers* (Paris, 1638): "Discord," and "Envy" (vol. 1, pp. 279, 565). None of these creatures is lame in her "other leg." (Spenser is fond of the phrase. Impotence, one of Maleger's attendants, is lame in her "other legge," *F. Q.* II. xi. 23. 6-8; see also the references to Malbecco's "other blinked eye," III. ix. 5. 5 and 27. 6-7.) For this idea Spenser

<sup>1</sup> Cited by H. Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* (London, 1870), pp. 258, 261.

may have gone to Homer's account of the "other" (=left) leg of the railing Thersites, as Upton believes. Kitchin accepts the suggestion of source, but holds that Occasion is not necessarily lame in the left leg, but merely in one leg. The illustration of *Amor virtutis* in *Q. Horati Flacci Emblemata* (published by Otho Vaenius, Antwerp, 1607; see pp. 26-7) lends weight to the belief that the lameness was in the left leg. The woman in this emblem holds a cane and supports herself on a wooden left leg. So does the woman who avenges a murder in illustration of the motto, "Culpam poena premit comes" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 180-181). From such graphic contemporary sources as these, I think, Spenser probably derived the ideas that are combined in his unclassical figure of Occasion.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

### A SPENSER PARALLEL

In the *Faerie Queene* there is a verbal parallel which indicates Spenser's acquaintance with the romance *Sir Degare*. Duessa's beast is described as having

An yron brest, and backe of scaly bras,  
And all embrewd in bloud, his eyes did shine as glass.  
(*FQ*, I, vii, 17.)

The sixteenth-century version of *Sir Degare* says of the dragon that

His eyen were bright as any glasse,  
His scales were harde as any brasse (l. 315 f.).<sup>1</sup>

Spenser's use of the same rhyme-words makes an otherwise evident parallel convincing. It is significant that Spenser's lines are strikingly similar to the sixteenth-century version of *Sir Degare* alone, but he may have read any of the three editions of the romance printed during the century.<sup>2</sup>

GEORGE P. FAUST

*Princeton University*

---

<sup>1</sup> Ed. E. V. Utterson, *Select Pieces of Early English Popular Poetry*, London, 1817, Vol. II, p. 114 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For the relation of the texts and for variants, see my unpublished dissertation, *Sir Degare: A Study of the Texts and Narrative Structure*, deposited in the Library of Princeton University, 1932, pp. 29, 32, and 34.

## SERMONS AND MIRACLE PLAYS

Among the MSS. of Merton College one of the most interesting is No. 248, which consists of a collection of sermons compiled, apparently about 1350, by Dr. John Sheppey, Benedictine monk, Lecturer at Oxford and Bishop of Rochester from 1352 to 1360. On the first page is recorded the following statement by Bishop Reed of Chichester, who purchased the book from Bishop Sheppey's executors and presented it to the Merton library:

*Tertium volumen sermonum per dom. Joh. de Shepeia S. theol. D. monachum Roffensem et postea ibidem episcopum pro suo tempore in univers. Oxon. collectorum.*

These sermons were composed by a number of preachers, several of whom are named on the margins.

The liberal interspersing of English rimes in many of these sermons in this collection suggests that they were designed for a popular audience. Some of the material included in this collection is not presented in finished form but consists rather of mere notes or outlines for sermons. The passage printed below may unquestionably be regarded as affording an example of such sermon notes:

Merton Coll. MS., 248, Fol. 166<sup>a</sup> (Col. 1.)<sup>1</sup>

He sent fro aboue a ouercummyer mythyest  
 he sent fro aboue a leche scillest  
 he sent fro aboue a marchange or a byer rychest  
 he sent fro aboue and toche me <sup>2</sup>

*primo dico* he sent fro aboue a ouercummyer mythiest & sic consequenter *similiter* in illo sermone de rotunda tabula ibi nam querens causam a primis parentibus quare prohibuit deus ne comedent de ligno paradysi & ille respondente ne forte mor[iamur—Cf. Gen. 3. 5] statim dixit dyabolus:

In thys tre [MS. ys thre] es alle hys myth  
 bot þer he ley and sayd nowth ryth

<sup>1</sup> On the top margin some lines have been trimmed away by the binder. One can make out:

Wan we wor vnmyti he strent vs	for þe seuze giftes of þe holy gast
Wan we wor blyþe he let vs	in soffastest of trowe

<sup>2</sup> Added on the lower margin:

and toke me wan ye fro deuel poer delyuer me  
 and toke me wan ye wiþ is mytiful hande rythit me  
 and toke me wan ye in to blis brow me.



ette þerof hy wil ye plydh:  
and witty saltow be  
god and ywel for to wyte  
al so wille as he.

The reference in these lines to the "sermo de rotunda tabula" awakens lively curiosity, though in regard to this matter I can add no further information.

More important still is the possible contact with the religious drama which this passage discloses. The six lines by Diabolus are strikingly dramatic in character; indeed they read like an extract from a vernacular play on the Fall. With them we may compare first the speech of Sathanas in York V:

To ete þer-of he you defende,  
I knawe it wele, þis was his skylle,  
By-cause he wolde non othir kende  
Thes grete vertues þat longes þer-till.  
For will þou see,  
Who etes the frute, of *goode and ille*  
*Shalle haue knowyng as wele as hee.*

The resemblance of York to the Merton lines in the italicized phrase is much closer, it will be noted, than it is to the Vulgate: "et eritis sicut dii, scientes bonum et malum," or to *Cursor Mundi*: "Als godds suld ʒee seluen be."

The corresponding play in the Towneley cycle is not available, owing to the loss of leaves from the MS. We compare next the words of Serpens in the Hegge cycle (*Ludus Coventriae*):

Of þis Appyl yf ʒe wyl byte  
Evyn as god is so xal ʒe be  
Wys of Connyng *as I ʒow plyte*  
lyke on to god in al degre.

The parallel between the words in italics and the phrase in Merton, "hy wil ʒe plydh" is arresting, but may perhaps be accounted for in both as a riming tag.

Finally, these lines in the Merton sermon are to be compared with the text of the second Chester play:

Eva. This tree that here in the middes is  
Eate we of it, we do amisse  
God said we shold dye, I-wis  
and we touched that tree.

Serpens. Woman, I say: leeve not this!  
 for yt shall not lose yow blisse  
 ne no Ioy that is his;  
 but be as wise as he.

God is coynt and wyse of wytt,  
 And wottes well, when yow eate hit,  
 then your eyes shalbe vnknit,  
 like goddes yow shall be.

The Chester play is distinctly closer to the phrasing of the Vulgate than the lines in the Merton MS. On the other hand, the English versions show very closely related stanza-forms:

	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3
Chester,	a	a	a	b	a	a	a	b
	4	4	4	3	4	4		
Merton,	a	a	a	b	a	b		

In both we have three four-accent *a*-lines followed by a three-accent *b*-line. The only difference, indeed, consists in the introduction in Chester of two extra *a*-lines in the second half of the stanza. Neither of these stanza-forms is at all usual in English verse of the period, so that the resemblance between the two texts in this matter is the more significant.

The speech of Diabolus in this Merton sermon probably was not composed by the homilist but taken over from some poem already existing. It has all the appearance of being an excerpt from a longer speech. And the terseness and vigor of the lines suggest that they were taken from a play of the Fall. Nevertheless, if these lines, as seems unquestionable, were composed before 1350, they are too early to be derived from any of the surviving English cycle plays. To suppose, on the other hand, that these fragmentary lines served as a source for any of the cycle plays would be absurd.

Their interest for the historian of the drama lies rather in the suggestion which they afford that the tradition of religious plays in the vernacular existed in England at an earlier date than any which can be established on the basis of the extant cycle plays. And this conclusion is, of course, in no way improbable. However, this recognition that there were probably plays in existence earlier than any which have come down to us should have the effect of making us cautious in attempting to determine too closely the textual relationships of the cycles which are preserved.

CARLETON BROWN

*New York University*

TESTER: *KNIGHT'S TALE*, 2499

The combat in the lists that takes place between Palamon and Arcite in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* is interesting and valuable by reason of the description it presents of a chivalric tournament of the fourteenth century.<sup>1</sup> In spite of the fairly systematic treatment accorded this passage by various editors, it seems that data for the correct interpretation of one point has not yet been brought forth. I refer to one of the verses in the opening section of Part Four where the activities and scenes in Athens on the morning of the great tournament are described:

And on the morwe, whan that day gan sprynge,	2491
Of hors and harneys noyse and claterynge	
Ther was in hostelryes al aboute;	
And to the paleys rood ther many a rout	
Of lordes upon steedes and palfreys.	2495
Ther maistow seen devisynge of harneys	
So unkouth and so riche, and wroght so weel	
Of goldsmythrye, of browdyng, and of steel;	
The sheeldes brighte, testeres, and trappures,	
Gold-hewen helmes, hauberkes, cote-armures;	2500
Lordes in parementz on hir courseres, <sup>2</sup>	
. . . . .	

All of the technical terms in this passage relating to armor appear to have been satisfactorily explained, save for the word "testeres" <sup>3</sup> in verse 2499. Skeat,<sup>4</sup> in his glossary, has defined the word, "headpiece," or a "steel cap." Hinckley,<sup>5</sup> Mather,<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The tournament in fourteenth century England has been briefly discussed by Robert Coltman Clephan, *The Tournament, Its Periods and Phases* (London, 1919), pp. 23-37.

<sup>2</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, New York, etc., 1933), vv. 2491-2501, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> The word is spelled "testeres" in the Ellesmere, Corpus, and Lansdowne MSS.; the Hengwrt and Cambridge give "testers," and the Petworth MS., "testeers." *A Six Text Print of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall, The Chaucer Society, London, 1868—.

<sup>4</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. Rev. Walter W. Skeat, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1900. Glossary in vol. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Harry Barrett Hinckley, *Notes on Chaucer*, Northampton [Mass.], 1906.

<sup>6</sup> *Chaucer's Prologue, The Knight's Tale, etc.*, ed. Frank Jewett Mather, Cambridge [Mass.], 1899.

Gilman,<sup>7</sup> Ingraham,<sup>8</sup> Pollard,<sup>9</sup> and Liddell<sup>10</sup> have likewise interpreted "testeres" as 'head-pieces,' or 'helmets.' In the recent *Cambridge Students' Chaucer*, edited by Professor F. N. Robinson, the rather puzzling explanation "headpiece (of a helmet)" is given. Notwithstanding this unanimity of opinion, the glossing of "testeres" as 'helmets' can scarcely pass unquestioned when one considers that in the next verse (v. 2500) "gold-hewen helmes" are listed. This last term could refer to nothing else than the metal tilting helmets worn by the knights while jousting, and consequently, it simply duplicates the usual interpretation given for "testeres." It would be strange if a fourteenth century courtier, who had doubtless seen more than one tournament, should resort to the use of such synonyms in describing a scene with which he was perfectly familiar. The inference is, of course, that "testeres" has not been correctly defined.

At first glance, the etymology of the word is of no assistance in finding a meaning different from the one that has been suggested. Testere,<sup>11</sup> in all probability, came from the Late Latin, *testera*, through the old French, *testiere*.<sup>12</sup> The Modern French form is *têtière*, while the English cognate is tester (a canopy for a bed). It is plain, then, that 'headpiece' or 'helmet' is at least a logical explanation of the Middle English term. It now remains to determine whether there was not current a fourteenth century meaning other than the rather general and definitely unsatisfactory one of 'headpieces' which Chaucer could reasonably have had in mind while writing this passage.

To judge from a quotation in Du Cange, the Late Latin *testera* had developed a specialized meaning as early as the twelfth century:

<sup>7</sup> *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. Arthur Gilman, Boston, 1879.

<sup>8</sup> *Geoffrey Chaucer's The Prologue to the Tales of Canterbury, the Knight's Tale, the Nun's Priest's Tale*, ed. Andrew Ingraham, New York, 1902.

<sup>9</sup> *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, ed. Alfred W. Pollard, London, 1886.

<sup>10</sup> *The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, the Knight's Tale, the Nonnes Preestes Tale*, ed. Mark H. Liddell, New York 1929.

<sup>11</sup> James A. H. Murray, etc., *A New English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1888-1928), s. v., tester.

<sup>12</sup> *Émile Littré, Dictionnaire de la langue française* (Paris, 1872), s. v., *têtière*.

Statuta Vercell. lib. 7. f. 170: Nullus molinarius audeat vel praesumat ducere vel duci facere per civitatem Vercellarum aliquem asinum vel aliam bestiam quadrupedem per se, nisi ducatur vel teneatur per cordam vel capistrum, vel frenum seu bretholam, vel Testeram in pena solidorum X.<sup>13</sup>

Thus *testera*, originally a piece of pottery, a skull, or sometimes a covering, became a sort of *frenum* or bridle. It was still a head-piece, but its special meaning was headpiece or headstall of a horse or an ass, and not necessarily the skull of a man. Another quotation cited by Du Cange<sup>14</sup> indicates that the Old French form, *testière*, was used precisely in this same sense.

Later on, the *testière* or *têtière* acquired a still more specialized significance as may be illustrated from Viollet-le-Duc:

La *têtière* est l'habillement de tête du coursier de guerre; le chanfrein est la pièce de fer qui garantit le front, l'entredeux des yeux et les narines de la bête. Il ne paraît pas que les chevaux fussent armés avant la fin du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. . . . Le musée d'artillerie de Paris possède une très-curieuse *têtière* avec son chanfrein. Cette défense est faite de feuilles de parchemin collées les unes sur les autres, et composant ainsi un carton très-résistant, prenant la forme du devant de la tête de la bête. Verticalement, est rivée une plaque d'acier qui protège le milieu. Les deux vues d'acier, en forme de coques, couvrent les yeux et sont rivées au carton, ainsi que les pièces qui garantissent les oreilles et les naseaux. . . . Cette pièce de harnais date de la fin du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle.<sup>15</sup>

Here, then, is a description of a piece of chivalric equipment—head-armor for the *destrier* or war-horse.

That the Middle English *testere* also had reference to the defensive equipment of the war-horse is borne out in the following passage from Caxton's *Book of the Ordre of Chyualry*:

To his hors is gyuen in his hede a testiere to sygnefye that a knyzt ought to do nonne armes without reason / For lyke as the hede of an hors goth to fore the knyght / Right soo ought Reason goo to fore all that a knyght doth /<sup>16</sup>

Whether Caxton's "testiere" was a piece of armor, or merely a

<sup>13</sup> Du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Parisiis, 1844-1848), s. v., *testera*.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, III, Glossaire français, s. v., *testière*.

<sup>15</sup> Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné du mobilier français* (Paris, 1872-1875), Part 8, s. v., *chanfrein*.

<sup>16</sup> *The Book of the Ordre of Chyualry*, tr. William Caxton, ed. T. P. Byles, EETS. 168 (London, 1926), pp. 85-86.

bridle cannot, of course, be determined with certainty. However, it seems most likely that it was the former of the two, since the bridle of the completely accoutered *destrier* would not be visible under his armor.

In the light of the above quotations, the passage in the *Knight's Tale* under scrutiny may be more clearly interpreted. By reading, for "testeres," 'head-armor for horses,' a special meaning which was certainly current in chivalric times is supplied. Moreover, the proposed reading eliminates the duplication in meaning of "testeres" and "gold-hewen helmes"—a fault which one is loath to attribute to Chaucer. Finally, this interpretation fits in very well with the following item, "trappures," which has been rightly glossed as the trappings or cloth housings<sup>17</sup> which, merely for the sake of presenting an elegant appearance, covered the big, Flemish coursers of the mediaeval knights from head to fetlock. The nature of the description makes one more than ever sure that the poet was drawing upon actual experience. In gazing about him on just such an occasion, he might well have seen 'armor made in strange and rich fashions and well constructed of steel, of embroidery, and by the goldsmith's art, shining shields, *head-armor for horses*, trappings, golden tilting helmets, hauberks, and armorial tunics.'

ROBERT W. ACKERMAN

*University of Michigan*

---

## THE DIVISION OF WORDS

"He got the requisite consent."

(*American Mercury*, xxvi, 263a.)

It is often my task to read Polish students' seminar exercises and reports, and most surely if any one of them had proffered me the above horrid example of word-division my blue pencil would have got unhesitatingly into action. Against other things too, which I noticed as I read on, with my attention to the ends of lines thus awakened: *noth-ing* (pp. 284a, 360a), *knowl-edge* (382b), *catas-trophe* (303b). I began to see that the type-setter

<sup>17</sup> There is a discussion of trappings in Clephan, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

was not guided by the same rules as I, an Englishman, had unthinkingly assumed.

What rules? I picked up some American and English magazines and books and began to look for the differences, if any. Up to a certain point, I soon found, we are agreed. Words are divided between two vowels: *audi-ence* (*Am. Merc.* 259a), between two consonants: *inten-sive* (258a), or after a long vowel or diphthong: *na-ture* (273b), *thou-sand*; except before certain common terminations: *mak-ing* (259b), *independ-ence* (295a), *morn-ing*, *threat-ened*.

It is when we come to the short vowel followed by a single consonant that a difference of practice begins to be seen. The *significance* (280b) of *Pres-ident* (261a) and *Gov-ernment* (*passim*) struck me as it were in the *stom-ach* (374b), most painfully. Such words, I thought off-hand, should be divided before the single consonant, unless it be *r* (*inter-est*, 328b). But *Liberty*, July 1st, 1933, in the course of its 54 pages showed me 34 further examples: *prop-er-ly*, *fam-ily*, *prom-ised*, *nev-er-the-less*, *ridic-ulous*, *col-umns*, *devel-opment*, and so on. The custom was evidently to attach a single consonant to the preceding vowel, if accented. Do we do this in England? Let me look further and compare.

The London *Strand* for July 1933 soon satisfied me that we don't: in its 112 pages I could find but 4 examples of division after a single consonant, and in the first two the consonant was *r*: *char-acters* (p. 78b), *char-acter-istic* (47), while in the other two the division was before a common termination: *mech-anic-ally* (30b), *natur-ally* (47). On the other hand, *pro-mises* (p. 26) and *pre-cedent* (41b) and *pro-bably* (60a) went clearly against the American rule. It seemed indeed that the magazine was chary of dividing words at all where it could be avoided by a slight adjustment of the type, and in general it was found that, whereas in fifty pages of *Liberty* were 601 divided words, in fifty pages of the *Strand* were only 220: an average of between 4 and 5 per page as against 12.

Similarly, the first hundred pages of Stuart Chase's *Mexico* gave *lav-enders* (p. 3), *prob-ably* (28 &c.), *mech-anisms* (40), *decorating* (109), altogether 25 words divided after a single consonant, whereas in the first hundred pages of an English-printed book, J. C. Curry's *The Indian Police*, were but 5: *organ-ized* (p. 35), contrasting with *stabi-lize* in *Mexico* (p. 77), *peas-antry*

(41), *admin-istration* (42), *exam-ination* (57), and *gen-eral* (63); and in general, *Mexico* had 454 divided words in the course of these pages, *The Indian Police* 327.

A hundred and five years ago Noah Webster laid down certain rules for the division of syllables, which were intended rather for learners than for type-setters. "The first and principal rule in dividing syllables," he says,<sup>1</sup> "is not to separate letters that belong to the same syllable, except in cases of anomalous pronunciation." However, this is not of much help, since our problem is just, to which syllable does a single consonant belong? "The best division of syllables," he continues, "is that which leads the learner most easily to a just pronunciation. Thus, *hab-it*, . . . *an-i-mal*, *al-i-ment*, *pol-i-cy*, *eb-o-ny*, *des-ig-nate*, *lam-ent-a-ble*, *pref-er-a-ble*." Here we have to remark that the modern phonetic approach is totally different, and no learner is helped, whether to a "just pronunciation" or to a just spelling, by the laborious division into *lam-ent-a-ble*. What are important are the etymological elements of which a word is composed: *lament* + *-able*. "An exception to this rule occurs in such words as *vicious*, *ambition*, in which the *ci* and *ti* are pronounced like *sh*. In this case it seems preferable to divide the words thus: *vi-cious*, *ambi-tion*." These are the cases of "anomalous pronunciation" referred to above, pronunciation, that is, unphonetically represented by the spelling; and Americans and English are in agreement that *ci* or *ti* representing [ʃ] should be attached to the following syllable. Finally, "in dividing the syllables of derivative words it seems advisable to keep the original entire, unless when the division may lead to a wrong pronunciation. Thus, *act-or*, *help-er*, *op-press-or* may be considered as a better division than *ac-tor*, *hel-per*, *op-pres-sor*. But it may be eligible in many cases to deviate from this rule. Thus *op-pres-sion* seems to be more convenient both for children in learning and for printers than *op-press-ion*."

What is a syllable? "As much of a word as is uttered with the help of one vowel," said Samuel Johnson in the 18th century. "A unit of pronunciation," says the OED, "forming a word or part of a word and containing one vowel sound and often consonant(s) preceding and/or following this." And "Orthography,"

<sup>1</sup> *A Dictionary of the English Language*. New York, 1828. Reprinted by E. H. Barker. 2 vols. 4°. London, 1932. p. liii.



says J.<sup>2</sup> is "the art of combining letters into syllables, and syllables into words." Yet neither he nor the OED gives us rules for syllable-division. And the language contains no simple word for it. We may take our choice between *syllabication*, *syllabification* and *syllabization*; obviously the process is not so common as *spelling*.

The present-day Webster<sup>3</sup> lays down ten elaborate rules, which, I am informed by Prof. Malone, are probably followed by most Americans. Bearing in mind the frequent distinction between vowel or consonant letters and vowel or consonant sounds, we find their essence to be that deduced in our second and third paragraphs above. Words, when necessary at the ends of lines of print, are to be divided (a) between vowel sounds, (b) between consonant sounds, or (c) before a single consonant sound; but recognizable prefixes and suffixes are to keep their entities. However, "When the preceding vowel is short and under an accent the consonant is carried back with it." What is the origin of this apparently arbitrary ruling?

It becomes clear that all Webster's counsel, old and new, is guided by the principle that the word must fall into two parts which may be easily and smoothly pronounced. Which, then, is better: *prob-able* or *pro-able*? American type-setters have at least this point in their support when preferring the former, that when abbreviating such a word, jocularly as in "half a sec!" or lexicographically as in "Gear: prob. from ON *gervi*," or again in that "Anon." responsible for so many poems in our anthologies, we naturally attach the consonant to the preceding vowel. The present writer however would emphasize that there is actually not the slightest pause in the articulation: the division is purely visual. Hence it appears to be a matter solely of habit and custom which is preferred. He feels that he would be "led most easily to a just pronunciation" by [prɒ bəb!] rather than by [prɒb əb!], [prɒ mɪs] rather than by [prɒm ɪs].

But *proj-ect* and *noth-ing* and *knowl-edge* are another matter. Where words are compounded of independent elements, whether Greek, Latin, French, or English, they should surely be divided

<sup>2</sup> *A Dictionary of the English Language . . . to which are prefixed a History of the Language and an English Grammar*, 8th ed. London, 1799. First page of the Grammar (no pagination).

<sup>3</sup> *A New International Dictionary*. New York, 1933. p. lix.

etymologically, and the present writer cannot but regret that the *Am. Merc.* should print *econ-omists* (xxvi. 318) or *catas-trophe* (ib. 302), whereas the *Strand* goes right with *photo-grapher* (lxxxiv. 56b), *Pro-testants* (lxxxv. 608b), *extra-vagant* (lxxxv. 650a); or that *Mexico* should show *astron-omers* (p. 35), whereas *The Indian Police* has *demo-cracy* (p. 106); *Mexico an-alyzing* (108), whereas *IP decapit-ating* (230). Yet *The Indian Police* sometimes falls from grace: *des-cribed* (195), *equiv-alent* (200).

In general we may conclude that American type-setters divide words more freely and with less nicety than their English confrères—though seldom with such ruthlessness as in the example which gave rise to this discussion. (Do any of your readers defend it?) They have set up a rule, based apparently on the dictum of Webster, that a short-vowelled accented syllable must end with a consonant; and subordinated to it, etymological considerations are made of no account. Against this the present writer, even if a voice crying in the wilderness, utters his serious protest.

B. W. A. MASSEY

*Poznań, Poland*

---

#### AN OMISSION FROM CURME'S SYNTAX

It is strange to find omitted from so complete a treatise on English usage as Curme's *Syntax* any discussion or authorisation of a common interpretation of the past perfect: the use of this tense to express what had been going on prior to a past time and was still continuing, as in "The day I was there he had been ill a week." Curme says of the past perfect: "This form represents a past action or state as completed at or before a certain past time,"<sup>1</sup> and adds no secondary uses. The statement is obviously too exclusive. The author does give, however, a secondary use of the present perfect to express an action or state begun in the past and still continuing (p. 360). The past perfect is the only tense that represents in the past the parallel to this present perfect.

A number of other fairly complete English grammars omit mention of this pluperfect use. To this fact may be due the non-com-

<sup>1</sup> George O. Curme: *Syntax*, D. C. Heath and Co., Boston, 1931; p. 361. Quoted by permission.

mittal or slightly erroneous statements in such foreign language grammars in English as Dunn's *Portuguese Grammar* and Ramsey's *A Textbook of Modern Spanish*. Here the authors fail to state that the foreign imperfects, which are used to express the conception with which we are concerned, indicate the continuation of a past action *into* a subsequent period in the past. However, a vast majority of the reference grammars in English dealing with Latin or the modern languages point out the continuation in such cases and call for the English pluperfect to render the construction.

RONALD B. WILLIAMS

Lake Forest College

---

### A NOTE ON THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PROGRESS PIECES

This list of "progress pieces," which supplements Dr. R. H. Griffith's much longer one,<sup>1</sup> adds little to our knowledge of the genre except to suggest that its vogue waned more slowly than has been supposed. The more interesting items are very briefly described.

1711. El[ijah] Fenton. An Epistle to Mr. Southerne . . . , Jan. 28. 1710/II.<sup>2</sup>  
[This poem contains two distinct "progress" elements: the history of English drama from Shakespeare, and the "progress" of the "Grecian Muse" through the Roman period and that of the Druids to the times of Waller and Granville.]
1726. [John Mawer.] The Progress of Language . . . , Wherein is prov'd the first Language: Occasion'd by his Majesty's . . . Encouragement of Modern Languages. [Chinese starts the "progress,"]
1732. Anon. Taste and Beauty, An Epistle to the . . . Earl of Chesterfield. [Includes a "progress" of architecture from Egypt to Greece to Rome.]
1738. William Carteret. The Progress of Petitioning; in Three Epistles to Mr. Pope. *Miscellaneous Works in Verse and Prose*, 1752, 2 vols., II, 1-32. [A curious specimen as will appear from the "Advertisement" (p. 3):

Most of the Lines in these Epistles were written in the Year 1731, merely in Pursuit of an odd Thought, that accidentally produced a few of them. . . . They were all contained in a single Piece, in the

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Progress Pieces of the Eighteenth Century," *Texas Review*, v (1920), 218-33.

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, the piece was published at London.

Form of an Epistle to that Gentleman [Pope]. But casting my Eyes over them again, I found in them a natural *Progress of Petitioning*, rising gradually from a pretty reasonable Request to a very unreasonable one. The Title also, thus inadvertently hit on, pleas'd me well, as I did not remember ever to have seen it among the many Progresses that had been published.

Note to "Epistle the First," pp. 5-6. The three Things for which our Author petitions his Patron, are, 1st. That he would give an impartial Judgment of his Writings; 2ly. That he would recommend him to the Town; 3dly. That he would help him to a Place. Each of these Requests our Poet has made the Subject of an Epistle.]

1739. Anon. The Progress of a Female Rake, An Epistle from Libertina to Sylvia. *The Curiosity: Or, Gentleman and Lady's Library*, 2d ed., pp. 35-47.
1752. [Thomas] Hudson. The Progress of Man, In Two Epistles to a Clergyman. *Poems on Several Occasions. In Two Parts . . .*, Newcastle-on-Tyne, pp. 145-59.
1762. Anon. The Progress of Lying, A Satire.
- [1770?] [T. P. Christian.] The Progress of War; a Poem By an Officer, Norwich, n. d.
1774. [William] Richardson. The Progress of Melancholy, A Vision. *Poems, Chiefly Rural . . .*, 4 ed., Glasgow, 1781, pp. 97-119.
1775. [Samuel Jackson Pratt.] The Progress of Painting.
1776. [Richard Graves.] The Progress of Gallantry, In Three Cantos. *Euphrosyne: Or, Amusements on the Road of Life . . .*, pp. 177-90. [Love as it affects people of different ages, and how "domestic bliss" may be realized.]
1778. [William Hayley.] A Poetical Epistle to an Eminent Painter [George Romney]. [A sort of progress of painting.]
1780. [Samuel Dexter.] The Progress of Science, A Poem Delivered at Harvard College April 21, 1780, By a Junior Sophister, n. p.
1780. John Walters. The Progress of Religion, Addressed to . . . The Lord Bishop of Landaff. *Poems*, Oxford, pp. 103-06. [In Latin.]
1784. [Edward] Jerningham. The Rise and Progress of the Scandinavian Poetry, in Two Parts.
1794. John Bidlake. The Progress of Poetry, Painting, and Music. *Poems*, pp. 1-49.
1806. Mrs. Mary Robinson. The Progress of Melancholy, A Fragment. *Poetical Works*, 3 vols., 1, 43-48. [A collection of motifs generally associated with melancholy rather than a true progress poem.]
1808. Martin Kedgwin Masters. The Progress of Love, Boston, Mass. [Not so much a progress piece as a didactic poem on all varieties of love—divine, carnal, virtuous—culminating in a glorious "Picture of connubial happiness."]
- [1810?] Thomas Rhodes. The Progress of Genius [and] The Progress of Envy. *Poetical Miscellanies*, Coventry, n. d., pp. 1-48, 73-82.
1818. [Joseph Broster.] The Progress of Time. *The Rivers of Aædæ and The Progress of Time, A Moral and Descriptive Poem*, Macclesfield.

1823. John Petre. *The Progress of Poetry. Trifles*, pp. 1-4. [A late example of a genuine old-fashioned progress poem.]
1838. W[illiam] B[ell] Scott. *The Progress of Mind: An Ode. Hades; or, The Transit: and The Progress of Mind, Two Poems*, pp. 31-47. [Perhaps the latest true example of this literary type. John Clare's *The Progress of Rhyme* (written c. 1830-35?) can hardly qualify.]

ROBERT A. AUBIN

*Harvard University*

---

### AN EARLY PERFORMANCE OF FIELDING'S *HISTORICAL REGISTER*

The date of the first performance of Henry Fielding's *Historical Register* has never been definitely determined. Since the performance for April 11, 1737, was advertised as the ninth day of its acting,<sup>1</sup> it has been conjectured that the first presentation could hardly have been later than March 31.<sup>2</sup> W. Nichols<sup>3</sup> has produced considerable evidence which suggests, however, that it was probably first acted earlier than that, possibly on Monday, March 21, 1737, as that is the date given in the published versions for the auction which Auctioneer Hen is holding (Act II). Observance of the pre-Easter theatrical holidays would also suggest a date as early as that,<sup>4</sup> but proof of an actual performance at that time has been lacking.

Corroborative evidence that the *Historical Register* was being performed over a week before the end of March appears in an entry in the diary of Viscount Percival, afterwards first Earl of Egmont. On Tuesday, March 22, 1737, he recorded a visit to the theater in the Haymarket to see the *Historical Register*:

Afterwards I went to the Haymarket Playhouse to see *The Historical Register*, wrote by Mr. Fielding. It is a good satire on the times and has a good deal of wit.<sup>5</sup>

EMMETT L. AVERY

*University of Chicago.*

---

<sup>1</sup> C. W. Nichols, "Fielding Notes," *MLN*, xxxiv (1919), 221.

<sup>2</sup> Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* (Cambridge, 1925), p. 328, gives this as a tentative date.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 221-2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* See also W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven, 1918), pp. 209-210.

<sup>5</sup> *The Diary of Viscount Percival, afterwards First Earl of Egmont* (London: Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1920-1923), II, 375.

## REVIEWS

*Bibliographie der Troubadours.* Von Dr. ALFRED PILLET, ergänzt, weitergeführt und herausgegeben von Dr. HENRY CARSTENS. Halle: Niemeyer, 1933 (*Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, Sonderreihe, Band 3). Pp. xlv + 518.

This long anticipated book, the "umfassendes und mühevoll-lebenswerk" of that distinguished scholar Pillet (died October 26, 1928) has at last appeared, thanks to the zeal, devotion and labor of Dr. Carstens. It more than fulfills the hopes of Provençal scholars. It is evident from the "Vorwort" that Carsten's share in it has been very considerable—nearly one-third of the whole,—while the laborious task of revision, completing the references up to the time of printing (the preface is dated October, 1931) and seeing the work through the press, has been his alone. Not many traces of the dual authorship are visible, however. The work as it stands is a distinct achievement, involving almost infinite research, meticulous accuracy, and repeated revisions. It will undoubtedly long survive as a monument of honor to both scholars concerned in preparing it.

First comes a section on "Quellen," which contains a revised list of all manuscripts with more than one song of one or more of the troubadours. It is followed by a list of those mediaeval works which contain quotations from the troubadours. Here the authors have overlooked or omitted the additional fragments from the novella *So fo el temps qu'om era gais* of Raimon Vidal discovered by Moliné y Brasés and published by him in the *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, XII (1912), which contain some quotations not found in the edition by Cornicelius. In my opinion, too, the *Leandreide*, attributed to Leonardo Giustiniani, should have been included in this list. It dates from the first quarter of the fifteenth century and contains several quotations from the troubadours, in a debased form of Provençal. To these is appended as an "Anhang" a list of manuscripts (generally in Old French or Latin), which contain a single song or a fragment of a song, and also literary works with single quotations. These two lists will be most helpful. Probably the new edition, by Jeanroy, of the *Jeu de sainte Agnès* (*Class. fr. du moyen âge*, 68; 1931) appeared too late to be included.

The main portion of the work, which comes next, is a revised and enlarged list of the troubadours and their songs, which is destined to supplant entirely the "Verzeichniss" of Bartsch, in his *Grundriss z. Gesch. d. prov. Litt.* (Elberfeld, 1872), so long the

*vademecum* of all Provençal scholars. This new list contains far more than Bartsch attempted to give. It contains: a, references to all that has been written on the subject of the particular troubadour listed under the number, and the editions, if such exist, of his works; b, references to the *Vida*, if found; c, an alphabetical list, as in Bartsch, of all the songs of the troubadour, with references to the folio or page of the manuscripts where the song may be found, and also references to any printed editions, critical or otherwise. Here the authors follow Bartsch closely, numbering the troubadours in the same order and listing additional names by means of letters added to the number. To Bartsch's list of 460 troubadours, Pillet and Carstens add 22 other names, while subtracting four from those given by him. Thus we have now a total of 478 troubadours known by name, although in some cases no song has been preserved in the known manuscripts. Lastly, after the authentic works, is appended a list of the songs falsely attributed to the troubadour concerned. Each song is listed alphabetically according to its first line. Altogether, this bibliography will be henceforward an incomparable instrument of research.

The final section of the work is formed by an index of all the rimes of the first line of each song given in the bibliography, arranged alphabetically. This too will be a great help to editors of Provençal texts in the future.

The bibliography being the chief part of the work, I have tested the accuracy of the indications found therein in two ways: first, by checking the references to the folio number of the song listed for the two MSS, B and I, of which I possess rotographs; second, by checking the references to the folio (or page) numbers of all the songs of the troubadour Aimeric de Pegulhan, of which I possess copies. The first check proved the absolute accuracy of all the references, although in a few cases the first line of the song in I (never in B) showed slight verbal variations from that given in the bibliography. As, however, the complete index of first lines of the MS I (Bib. nat. franç. 854) is easily accessible in the catalogue of manuscripts of that library, I do not consider it necessary to give these variants here. The second check disclosed one slight error and one omission. The song listed under the number 10, 6 is found in the manuscript R on folio 73, not 75. The song 10, 8 is also found in the manuscript N, f. 106, where it is anonymous. These tests prove the almost complete accuracy of the bibliography.

I append here a few slight additions to the bibliography, citing in each the number of the troubadour: 9. Aimeric de belenoi. A complete edition of this troubadour, by Mlle Marie Dumitrescu, is now in press for the *SATF*. 63. Bernart Marti. The Bibliography probably went to press before the critical edition of the songs of this troubadour by Hoepffner appeared in the *Classiques français*

*du moyen âge*, 61, 1929, 356, Peire Rogier. The bibliography neglects to state that song 6 of this troubadour is ascribed in I to Bernart de Ventadorn. 437, Sordel. The authors mark with an interrogation point the short *cobla* and *tornada* which appear in De Lollis' edition of this troubadour as number 33, beginning: *Nom meraveill sil marit son gilos*, and were evidently unable to place it. They do not include it in the bibliography nor the rimarium. It is found in I, f. 124, but is not listed in the Bib. nat. catalogue, as it is found immediately following the other *cobla*, number 32, and is not separated from it by a number or sign indicating that it is another song. It should however be so listed, as the rimes and measure are different.

It will be seen from the very slight character of these additions or corrections with what meticulous accuracy the authors have done their work. Doubtless, a close examination of the other unpublished manuscripts might disclose several more variants or additions. But the book is thoroughly trustworthy,—a splendid monument of coöperative scholarship. No one who studies any of the troubadours in the future can afford to neglect it.

WILLIAM P. SHEPARD

Hamilton College

---

*Novelistas españoles modernos*. By J. A. BALSEIRO. New York: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. xxi + 476.

Con la buena intención de remediar la escasez de obras generales sobre la moderna novela española, el Sr B. ha escrito un libro que, desgraciadamente, padece los mismos defectos de los ya publicados. No es más completo pues incluye nueve novelistas aislados, comenzando arbitrariamente por Valera y terminando con Palacio Valdés, sin dar en ninguna parte una idea de conjunto sobre la evolución del género. No es más metódico porque las excesivas citas y digresiones, sumadas a los análisis y argumentos de cada una de las novelas, oscurecen la valoración total del autor estudiado. Y, por último, salvo en dos o tres casos, no cambia ninguna de las opiniones generalmente aceptadas, muchas de las cuales necesitarían una completa revisión.

Téngase en cuenta, sin embargo, que el Sr B. no ha querido hacer una historia de la novela, o ficción como él suele decir. Su propósito ha sido reunir en un volumen, con fines principalmente didácticos, unos cuantos ensayos más o menos originales sobre los grandes novelistas, limitándose frecuentemente a resumir juicios ajenos. A veces, sin añadir comentario alguno, sale del paso insertando una carta o medio artículo de tal o cual firma no siempre autorizada. Solamente en el capítulo dedicado a Galdós, hace el



Sr B. cincuenta y tantas citas, algunas de cuatro o cinco páginas, y esto sin contar las frases breves de innumerables críticos españoles y no españoles. El método resulta un tanto abusivo, sobre todo considerando que muchas de estas citas están desprovistas de valor o no vienen a cuento.

Defecto no menos fastidioso es el de las digresiones. El Sr B. se aparta a menudo del asunto que está tratando, para perderse en consideraciones que, aunque a veces sean interesantes, se hallan completamente fuera de lugar. Hay alguna página imposible de ligar con la anterior ni con la siguiente. Y lo más lamentable es que estas digresiones significan un despilfarro de papel que hubiera debido emplearse en cubrir omisiones y en desarrollar algunos temas importantes sobre los cuales el autor pasa muy a la ligera.

Al lado de estas faltas, que cualquier discreto lector podrá notar, el libro tiene varias cualidades estimables. En primer lugar la imparcialidad con que el Sr B. juzga a cada novelista, respetando su credo literario aunque sea opuesto al suyo y desechando toda clase de prejuicios. Ni excesivamente blando ni injustamente duro con nadie, consigue librarse de caer en inútiles apasionamientos. La mayoría de sus juicios, si no siempre acertados, son evidentemente sinceros.

No nos dice el Sr B. nada nuevo sobre Valera, cuya familiar semblanza de escritor mundano, académico y finamente socarrón, reaparece en estas páginas con los mismos rasgos de siempre. Ni sobre Clarín, porque no es nuevo reclamar para él un puesto entre los novelistas de primera fila; ni sobre Palacio Valdés a quien trata con la acostumbrada benevolencia que suele inspirar; ni sobre el P. Coloma, aunque destaca más que otros críticos el tono grosero de *Pequeñeces* y su espíritu anticristiano. En cambio, al hablar de Pereda se aparta de la opinión corriente colocando a *Pedro Sánchez* entre las mejores novelas del siglo diecinueve. Esta afirmación resulta quizá exagerada, pero es cierto que *Pedro Sánchez* tiene por su técnica más moderna—o más antigua si se quiere—un interés que no despiertan otras producciones del tradicionalista hidalgo montañés. Es un punto de enlace entre la novela picaresca y la contemporánea. Baroja, cambiando el estilo y las ideas, hubiera podido escribir una obra muy semejante.

Del cacareado realismo de Pereda, en quien todavía queda mucho de costumbrismo a lo Fernán Caballero, dice el Sr B. que es solamente parcial porque rehuye sistemáticamente el problema erótico, sin duda para no escandalizar a sus píos lectores. Podrían alegarse otras razones que dejarían bastante mal parado el realismo del autor de *La Montálvez* y de *Don G. G. de la G.* La falsedad y la pobreza mental que el Sr B. censura en estas obras, vuelve a encontrarlas en las novelas tendenciosas de Galdós, que le parecen igualmente convencionales. Y con sobrado motivo. Menos funda-

mento tienen otros juicios relacionados con el autor de *Realidad*, cuyas ideas acerca del honor representan, según el Sr B., una revolución en la literatura española. Pero todos los nombres que aduce en apoyo de su aserto son nombres de poetas dramáticos, y tenían que serlo. Los novelistas, ya antes de Galdós—recuérdese *El celoso extremeño*—han sido menos rigurosos en la aplicación del código del honor, y no han dado siempre a la infidelidad conyugal una solución tan simplista como los dramaturgos.

Por falta de consistencia pecan también otras observaciones incluídas en el capítulo dedicado a don Benito—que es sin duda uno de los más endebles y confusos. En cambio, del estudio sobre la Pardo Bazán puede decirse lo contrario. Demuestra aquí el Sr B., al valorar una por una las novelas de la *muy femenina* condesa, que sabe distinguir lo bueno de lo malo y lo malo de lo mediocre, señalando con exactitud los puntos flacos de las obras maestras y los méritos aislados de las que no lo son. Sin embargo, lo más interesante del libro es la insistencia con que el Sr B. califica de romántico a Pedro Antonio de Alarcón. Romántico por *El escándalo* donde se encuentran todas las cualidades, situaciones y frases hechas del romanticismo; romántico por *La Pródiga* y por *El Niño de la Bola*; romántico por sus preferencias literarias—Byron, Espronceda, Zorrilla—y romántico en fin por su juventud misma, fecunda en andanzas, pasiones, duelos, fracasos y rebeldías. Por rutina se ha venido colocando a Alarcón entre los escritores realistas, como continuador de Fernán Caballero. Es un error. Fernán Caballero continúa en Pereda, que hace lo que ella quiso hacer y no pudo, mientras que Alarcón llega con *el Escándalo* adonde no habían llegado los novelistas románticos que le preceden. Falta en esta novela el culto al paisaje, por desarrollarse la acción en Madrid, pero en otras obras suyas, por ejemplo *El Niño de la Bola* o *De Madrid a Nápoles*—sigue el romanticismo—Alarcón rinde, fiel a su escuela, el debido tributo a la naturaleza.

En resumen, *Novelistas españoles modernos* contiene una buena cantidad de material utilizable: datos concretos, análisis concienzudos, observaciones atinadas. Sería de desear que el Sr B. convirtiera todo esto en una verdadera historia de la novela, reduciendo las citas a las imprescindibles; dando mayor ilación a los párrafos, que están como deshilvanados; sustituyendo los argumentos por una más eficaz crítica de conjunto y omitiendo las digresiones innecesarias, con lo cual le sobraría espacio para incluir a los autores que faltan.

JOSÉ ROBLES

---

*Les Odyssées philosophiques en France entre 1616 et 1789.* By N. VAN WIJNGAARDEN. Haarlem, 1932. Pp. 257. *Le Royaume d'Antangil, réimprimé sur l'unique édition de Saumur, 1616, avec des éclaircissements de FRÉDÉRIC LACHÈVRE.* Paris, La Connaissance, 1932. Pp. xxviii, 162.

Parmi les nombreuses utopies publiées en France au dix-septième et au dix-huitième siècles, M. Van Wijngaarden en a choisi vingt qui lui semblaient marquer "une réaction contre le système gouvernemental en vigueur du temps des écrivains." Il les a divisées en trois groupes ou trois périodes : avant Louis XIV, alors que le rêve humanitaire avait encore des visées modérées ; sous la monarchie de Louis XIV, où l'absolutisme aurait poussé les utopistes à des attaques violentes contre la religion et à la prédication du communisme intégral ; après la mort de Louis XIV, où en face du rêve communiste certains écrivains auraient proposé une république idéale, mais moins chimérique. C'est donc, en fait, une étude des utopies politiques et non des utopies philosophiques qu'a voulu faire M. Van Wijngaarden, et c'est ce qu'il a fait dans une certaine mesure en s'efforçant de découvrir dans ces récits imaginaires des allusions précises aux mœurs du temps et aux événements politiques. C'est la partie la plus nouvelle et la plus originale de son travail, bien qu'on puisse lui reprocher de pousser au noir, par endroits, la peinture de la vie au dix-septième siècle. Il faut également lui savoir gré d'avoir analysé en détail plusieurs utopies jusqu'ici négligées, en particulier la *Relation du Royaume des Féliciens* (1726) du Marquis de Lassay, la *Découverte de l'Empire de Cantahar* (1730) de Varennes de Mondane et les *Femmes militaires* (1736) de Rustaing de Saint-Jory.

Une fois de plus, nous sommes redevables à M. Lachèvre pour la réimpression d'un texte fort rare et au total d'un intérêt considérable. Cette édition est précédée d'une étude de M. René-Louis Doyon sur les "Variations de l'Utopie," étude qui ne s'impose ni par la sûreté de l'information ni par la justesse des généralisations auxquelles s'est complu l'auteur. La hardiesse aventureuse de M. Doyon est telle que M. Lachèvre lui-même a cru nécessaire de donner une "mise au point" d'un passage sur le règne de Louis XIV. Il aurait pu relever bien d'autres inexactitudes dans la prose de son préfacier. Les hypothèses qu'avait proposées M. Van Wijngaarden au sujet du *Royaume d'Antangil* méritaient plus de considération. M. Lachèvre ne peut cependant accepter que les simples initiales I. D. M. G. T. par lesquelles est désigné l'auteur représentent Jean Du Moulin Gentilhomme Tourangeau, ni que le livre marqué comme imprimé à Saumur par Thomas Portau soit sorti des presses de Jean Le Maire de Leyde. Sa démonstration, que nous ne pou-

vons reproduire ici, paraît concluante. Il faut donc nous résigner à ne point connaître l'auteur anonyme de cet ouvrage curieux qui est dû à la plume d'un ancien officier, féru de récits de voyages, imprégné de Rabelais et sinon calviniste au moins grand admirateur d'un christianisme primitif qui aurait échappé à l'influence de Rome. Sur le livre lui-même il y aurait beaucoup à dire et beaucoup à ajouter aux vingt pages que M. Van Wijngaarden lui a consacrées dans son ouvrage. A juste titre, M. Lachèvre a indiqué les rapports évidents avec l'Utopie de Thomas Morus dont la traduction française avait paru à Paris en 1550. Mais l'auteur a des idées bien à lui et qui à ma connaissance n'avaient jamais été développées en français dans un livre de ce genre. Les chapitres sur le gouvernement sont des plus intéressants à cet égard. Le royaume d'Antangil est en réalité un royaume fédératif, composé de cent-vingt provinces ayant chacune une capitale et une administration distincte. Une représentation nationale de 360 "personnages," choisis également parmi les nobles, les habitants des bourgs et les habitants des villages, est chargée de donner des avis au roi et à son conseil. Le souverain est élu à vie par un conseil de cent "grands et sçavants personnages," âgés de plus de 40 ans, qui ont le pouvoir de déposer "le Roy et le Vice-roy s'ils attentoient à remuer ou innover aucune chose en l'état." Voilà un système politique logiquement et solidement construit tel qu'on n'en retrouve ni chez Veiras ni chez Foigny et qui, à peu de choses près, est celui que les Fédéralistes auraient voulu instaurer aux Etats-Unis un siècle et demi plus tard. Les raisons de ces ressemblances si curieuses sont d'ailleurs plus simples qu'on ne pourrait croire. C'est que l'auteur d'*Antangil*, comme Montesquieu et les Fédéralistes de la fin du dix-huitième siècle, a lu Polybe et Cicéron. C'est à l'antiquité et non à son imagination qu'il emprunte les éléments essentiels de son gouvernement idéal. Ne serait-ce qu'à ce titre, malgré la gaucherie de son style, il mériterait de retenir l'attention des historiens. Il nous apporte en effet des indications précieuses sur la diffusion de certaines idées que nous avons trop tendances à attribuer au dix-huitième siècle et plus particulièrement au dix-huitième siècle anglais et qui, bien souvent, avaient été entrevues et même développées dès la fin du seizième. Les chapitres sur l'éducation, où l'influence de Rabelais est évidente, mais qui marquent sur le *Pantagruel* et le *Gargantua* un progrès évident, sont non moins dignes d'attention. C'est déjà d'une université moderne plus que d'une abbaye de Thélème que rêve l'auteur d'*Antangil*, et si les exercices militaires ne sont pas oubliés, la préparation que reçoivent les jeunes gens a pour objet essentiel de les préparer aux fonctions de l'Etat et de leur permettre de parvenir aux honneurs autrement que par "achapts, ventes, troques ou faveur." Avec trop de modestie, M. Lachèvre s'est refusé à

mettre en lumière tout ce qu'il y avait d'original dans cette "première utopie française." Il mérite toute notre reconnaissance pour avoir le premier signalé et mis à notre disposition un texte dont la valeur littéraire peut être médiocre, mais qui constitue un document de premier ordre pour les historiens des idées.

GILBERT CHINARD

---

*Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance.* A Study of the Sources of Chrestien de Troyes' "Yvain" and Other Arthurian Romances. By CHARLES BERTRAM LEWIS. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932. Pp. xviii + 332.

In Arthurian romance it is necessary for each new champion to slay his predecessor if he would become the guardian of the fountain. So it is with Arthurian scholarship. Dr. Lewis surveys the whole field of theory regarding the sources of Chrétien de Troyes, and vanquishes every foe. Of those who believe in Celtic origins he observes that none has proposed any adequate explanation of the "storm-spring theme" in the *Yvain*. For this a parallel has long been recognized in Ulrich's *Lanzelet*, where the spring is located in the oak forest of Dodona. Dr. Lewis infers that the motif in both instances has to do with a survival of rain-making ritual (as Nitze once suggested), and that it is derived specifically from the cult of Zeus at Dodona, where there were oak-grove, spring, and rainmaking. The episode in *Yvain* is examined in detail in the present study; and similarities are pointed out in the ceremony attached to the cult of the thunder-god. The reasoning is close and the evidence important. We must be grateful that the case is presented in so thorough a fashion by one who testifies that he himself was convinced against his will. Every possibility of a source or analogue for the story should be presented and duly scrutinized, and critics should rejoice if anyone who offers a new hypothesis shows fervor.

But we do not stop here. The ceremony of the new priest defeating the old at Dodona is, we are informed, reflected in the Joie de la Cort episode of the *Erec* and in many other stories. For both the *Yvain* and the *Erec* Chrétien drew considerably on the adventure of Theseus with the Minotaur. The *Lancelot* gives us again the rape of Helen of Troy, and the *Perceval* offers anew the material connected with the house of Atreus. Such a brief summary of the conclusions alone doubtless seems unfair; for it lacks the support of the rich detail in the argument, and any feeling for the skill and sobriety with which, early in the book, the author

proceeds. But the fault is ultimately his own. By statements here and there we soon discover the goal toward which he is rushing: "If, then, there is nothing Celtic in *Erec et Enide*, and nothing Celtic in *Yvain*, there is in all probability nothing Celtic in any other Arthurian romance . . ." (p. 240). "Lastly, the story of *La Mule sanz frain* might well be a mediaeval travesty of the journey of Herakles to the land of the Amazons where he won the girdle of Queen Hippolyte" (p. 296). "If this conception of the genesis of the Breton romances is correct, it is evident that the whole theory of the Celtic sources of the Arthurian poems is badly shaken, not to say overthrown, and we can now, without any qualms, relegate it to the limbo of more or less plausible but wrecked hypotheses" (p. 297).

Now this is not temperate scholarship. It is not even controversy. One is tempted to burlesque the whole proposition by asking what conspiracy was afoot to prompt writers from Nennius to Malory thus to set forth a classical heritage in disguise. Was there nothing available nearer at hand, say a story now called the beheading-game, or some tale of a journey to fairy-land, or a bit of narrative about a fairy-mistress, to give a more authentic touch of the obviously desired Celtic quality? Let us for the time being waive the question as to whether the theory of Celtic origins may be regarded as established; the fact is that the evidence collected to-day is vast, and Dr. Lewis cannot deal with more than a very little of it. He has plenty to do in his attempt to establish his own case for the influence of the cult of Zeus. Whether or not he has a right to call Loomis's theory far-fetched, he forgets how much his own discussion is built on inferences. For example on page 40 in studying the rites of Dodona he says: "In the following pages we hope to be able to show that Mr. Cook's conjecture is correct, that succession to the priesthood and kingship was indeed decided by a struggle to the death between the king and his rival." But the following pages derive from this conjecture! And later we read the confident statement that "when the priestly king of Dodona was eventually defeated and slain, he was succeeded in his charge by his assailant, who cut off his head and fixed it on the castle wall or impaled it on a stake" (p. 126). The circle is clear.

He objects that the proponents of the Celtic theory have no likely parallel to offer for the storm-raising spring; but he himself can show no real reflection of the labyrinth episode in Chrétien, and surely this is an essential feature of the adventure with the Minotaur. His sources in Greek for the grail and the lance it is hard to take seriously. The similarity of Chrétien's tree with the birds to the oak with three doves, even if the doves increased and multiplied, is not impressive. The cumulative force of analogies like these does not tell in the fashion that he hopes. One even

finds a hint (pp. 265-266) of some connection between the blood-drops on the snow which remind Perceval of his lady's cheeks (and us of the Celtic use of color in description) and bloody drops in Aeschylus which pleaded "for other bloodshed." The only trouble is that "in Chrétien's poem that passage is out of place. In Chrétien's source it must have preceded the act of revenge" (p. 266, n. 1). But what about the actual documents used by the French poet? Can Lewis show a closer analogue than any so far offered by Brown or other scholars? I take the most important, the hypothetical source of the storm-spring episode. Of this the author tells us that Chrétien probably knew more than one version (p. 132). The author of the *Bel Inconnu* went back to one of these at a point where his account is more like the original than Chrétien's (p. 115). Presumably Ulrich von Zatzikhoven knew at least one for reasons already indicated. In dealing with his source, moreover, Chrétien made important changes in his material (p. 142). It is surprising, then, to learn that of these several documents not a trace survives.

The risk of using circumstantial evidence in Arthurian scholarship is like that of hunting for acrostic signatures. The verdict is likely to be fatal all round. The best part of the present study is that related to the question of the spring itself, and the rest can be dispensed with. For the adventure of Yvain in general the idea of an Otherworld journey has the support at least of medieval writers, as Brown has shown. Yvain was one of the heroes who had the reputation of having traveled to the Otherworld, and I suspect that they knew more about him than we do. If Chrétien changed the Minotaur into the Herdsman, then he not only missed the quality of the classics, but he adopted, if I may have my guess, a Celtic manner. The *Isle as Puceles* is less satisfactorily explained by the tribute of the Minotaur than by the Celtic maidenland. In general one is not persuaded that the analogues proposed are close; and one observes that Dr. Lewis takes precious little account of literary coincidence as a possibility, and that he ignores the idea of a common literary inheritance, like that of the so-called Aryan expulsion and return formula. If, then, we ignore everything in his study except the "storm-spring theme" we may grant provisionally that Chrétien derived the idea of the spring itself from Dodona and its rites. But even here we find that Lewis shows that the cult of the thunder-god reached Gallic territory early (p. 210), and so the spring itself may have been taken over without the further detail of the ceremony, which, we recall, was largely hypothetical. On second thoughts it is astonishing how little we really know about Dodona! After all, even today, any scholar who blows a horn near the Arthurian fountain is likely to bring a thunder-storm down on his head.

HOWARD R. PATCH

*The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William Lower. With a Reprint of The Enchanted Lovers.* By WILLIAM BRYAN GATES. Philadelphia, 1932. Pp. 166. (University of Pennsylvania Thesis.)

The place of Sir William Lower among the cavalier dramatists has too long been obscured. It is fitting that he should at last receive attention and that his original plays should be reprinted. Mr. Gates reviews Lower's life, discusses his translations from Corneille, Quinault, and Scarron, presents an analysis of *The Phoenix in Her Flames* and *The Enchanted Lovers*, with an examination of their sources, and evaluates Lower's blank verse. The reprint of *The Enchanted Lovers*, appended to this essay, will be welcomed by all students of pre-Restoration drama.

Although Mr. Gates does not claim for Lower a higher rank than that of "a third or fourth rate writer," some of the limitations of the dramatist are not illustrated. Passages might well have been cited to indicate Lower's obliviousness to such characteristics of Corneille's style as balance, alliteration, and conciseness. As Mr. Gates would acknowledge, it signifies little that the translator has been "faithful to the sense of the original" who adapts Corneille's lines:

Quand je vois de tes murs leur armée et la nôtre,  
Mes trois frères dans l'une, et mon mari dans l'autre,<sup>1</sup>

as:

When I see drawn up 'fore thy walls both Armies,  
my three brave Brothers in the one, and my  
undaunted Husband in the other . . .<sup>2</sup>

The criticism of Lower's dramatic technique in his original plays is very much to the point; and the vigor of one of his portraits, the Fletcherian heroine Ismenia, is rightly commended. In the final chapter one misses critical comment on Lower's romantic temper.

Following, in the main, Thomas Seccombe's sketch of Lower's life in the *DNB.*, Mr. Gates has added a few details, chiefly regarding Lower's exile in Holland. The attempt, in the succeeding chapters, to envisage Lower as "strictly a man of his age" is not wholly successful, since, while urging other aspects of Lower's romanticism, Mr. Gates discounts too much the influence of contemporary Platonism. The indebtedness of Lower to famous romances by Heliodorus and Eustathius is emphasized, in the latter case, too strongly. *Les Amours d'Ismene et d'Isménias* could not have suggested to Lower the Arcadian paradise of *The Enchanted Lovers*, secondary characters who display love's caprices in the pastoral manner, and a ruthless enchantress who tyrannizes over her victims. Evidences of the influence of contemporary English

<sup>1</sup> *Horace*, I, i.

<sup>2</sup> *Horatius*, I, i.



dramatists on Lower should have been noted. The conduct of a number of the Platonic ladies of Carlell and D'Avenant might have set Mr. Gates' mind at rest as to Lucinda's "frank, direct manner" of courting Amandus. Among the probable sources of *The Phaenix in Her Flames* should be listed Carlell's *The Deserving Favourite* (pr. 1629). The fortunes of Lower's Lucinda in several respects parallel those of Carlell's Cleonarda. Both princesses fall in love at first sight with wounded heroes, whose wounds they dress and to whom they confess their love. The young men, whose affections are elsewhere engaged, politely check these advances. Shortly before the close of her adventures, Cleonarda declares that if the God of Love will not aid her, she will devote to the service of Diana "the loath'd remnant of my life." Lucinda, at Amandus' death, is to carry out such a project, vowing to renounce all pleasures and spend "the remnant of my dayes" as Diana's votary. The rôle of Alecto recalls that of Iacomo. Both villains seek to advance their own fortunes by ruining rival lovers. Professing friendship, Iacomo informs the Duke of Lysander's love for Clarinda, which he discovered through eavesdropping, and suggests Lysander's murder. Alecto adopts a similar course with Perseus. In both cases, the proposal of murder is rejected, and the lovers oppose each other in a duel. The fact that Lower makes use of conventions of Platonic intrigue strengthens Mr. Gates' contention that minor writers frequently "show best the direction of the literary currents of a period."

KATHLEEN M. LYNCH

Mount Holyoke College

---

*Thomas Mann's Novel 'Der Zauberberg.'* A Study by HERMANN J. WEIGAND. New York-London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1933. Pp. ix, 183.

Dr. Weigand's study of Thomas Mann's novel *Der Zauberberg* seems like an answer to the demand put forward in Professor Martin Schütze's recently published *Academic Illusions* that scholars in the field of literature occupy themselves less with the minutiae of "research" and devote more attention to esthetic appreciation of the works of great authors. This thoughtful, thorough guide to the very core of a subtle work of art makes one feel that perhaps Professor Schütze sees things a bit too darkly in his description of our graduate instruction in literature; for when a professor's interests are of the sort manifested by the author of our volume his classroom instruction cannot fail to infect his students with a similar spirit.

A brief review cannot even sketch the numerous facets of *Der Zauberberg* which Dr. Weigand reveals. He classifies the work as a Bildungsroman along with Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, Keller's *Grüner Heinrich*, and Stifters *Nachsommer*. He shows it to be, among other things, symbolical in Goethe's sense of the word, a Zeitroman indicting the pre-war Western civilization, a spiritual autobiography of Thomas Mann, a philosophical novel concerned with man's relation to the universe as a whole, and a didactic work calling the German nation to an observance of their highest cultural ideals. In his *The Modern Ibsen*, published nine years ago, Dr. Weigand by patient, detailed analysis revealed much that lies beneath the surface in the enigmatic Scandinavian, and in the present work he delves with the same shrewdness into the psycho-analytical background of the hero. He brings a broad literary knowledge to bear on his discussion of Thomas Mann's relation to the Romanticists in the chapters dealing with "disease" and "irony." He shows, by the way, that Thomas Mann, the realist, has his hero's notion (derived from Novalis and other Romanticists) that disease brings about greater sensibility or spirituality, turn into disillusionment after a short experience in the sanitarium. Striking too are the consequences which Dr. Weigand in the last chapter draws from the seance. It is a great temptation to mention more examples from the wealth of fascinating material in the book, but I shall call attention to but one more: the discussion in the notes of Thomas Mann's revision of his *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen* after Germany had become a republic.

Dr. Weigand's analysis of Thomas Mann's subtle and daring effort at "integration" in this all-comprehensive novel is masterful, but one may doubt his judgment as to its artistic success. He is not unaware of the pedantry that obtrudes itself in the composition of *Der Zauberberg*, but he meets this charge with an argument by analogy (p. 92): "I suppose the Gothic cathedrals, too, were pedantic in their articulation." Somehow this does not sound quite convincing. Since our author frequently compares *Der Zauberberg* with *Wilhelm Meister* I should like to hazard a judgment in the form of a ratio: *re* artistic unity and vitality *Der Zauberberg* is to *Buddenbrooks* as *Wilhelm Meister* is to *Hermann und Dorothea*—which latter work Schiller called the peak of Goethe's artistic production.

A. E. ZUCKER

*University of Maryland*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

*Alfred de Vigny, Contribution à sa Biographie Intellectuelle.* Par F. BALDENSPERGER. Etudes Françaises, Trentième Cahier. Paris, "Les Belles-Lettres," 1933. Pp. 200. Dans ce volume, M. Baldensperger a réuni huit études dont quelques-unes avaient déjà paru sous forme d'articles et qui toutes apportent des renseignements précieux sur la formation intellectuelle de Vigny et la portée de son œuvre. Nous ne pouvons les analyser en détail ici; il sera cependant permis de signaler la première dans laquelle se trouve reconstitué le milieu ancestral de Vigny. Le chapitre sur les "Mercredis de Vigny" permet de préciser le prestige dont le poète jouissait, malgré la renommée éclatante de Hugo, auprès d'un groupe d'amis discrets et dévoués qui lui restèrent fidèles même après qu'il se fut retiré au Maine Giraud. L'étude sur "Les Etats-Unis dans la vie et l'œuvre d'Alfred de Vigny" révèle un Vigny américanisant, non point simple disciple de Chateaubriand, mais curieux d'histoire américaine, suivant Tocqueville, consultant Emile Chevalier et lisant les traités religieux de Channing. Enfin dans les remarques critiques sur le titre du recueil posthume de Vigny, "Destinées" ou "Poèmes philosophiques," M. Baldensperger étudie, avec plus de détails qu'il n'avait pu le faire dans la préface de son édition publiée en juillet 1914, non pas seulement le titre que Vigny comptait donner à ses derniers poèmes, mais l'ordre probable dans lequel il les aurait présentés. Il montre en particulier, comment une étiquette que l'auteur n'aurait peut-être pas choisie a pu conférer au recueil une intention implicite "d'absolu pessimisme" qui n'était pas dans la pensée du poète.

G. C.

*Étude sur les Epistres Morales d'Honoré d'Urfé.* Par SŒUR MARIE LUCIEN GOUDARD. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1933. Pp. 164. Although five or six editions of this work appeared between 1598 and 1620, it seems to have been so soon forgotten that d'Urfé remained for most readers the author of the *Astrée* alone. Yet these discourses have some importance for an understanding of the author and of his novel and constitute one of the links in the chain of thought that connects the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Sister Goudard points out the Stoic and Neo-Platonic elements in the epistles and shows in detail the very considerable debt that d'Urfé owed to Plutarch. She reserves for future investigation a similar study of his borrowings from Ficino. It would also be of interest to indicate the connection between the

thought of the *Epistres* and that of the *Astrée*. She has made her investigation with great thoroughness and admirable impartiality, even in handling such difficult questions as Saint Bartholomew's and the League. She admits that the *Epistres* "ne contiennent rien d'original" and that "leur vogue ne survécut guère à l'auteur." As she claims so little for her subject, one is the more inclined to accept her conclusion that it deserves more than "le coup d'œil rapide des curieux."

H. C. L.

---

*Friesche Dialectgeographie.* Door J. J. Hof. Martinus Nijhoff 's-Gravenhage 1933. Pp. xiv, 277, met 68 Kaarten. This splendid work devoted to a study of the gradually disappearing Frisian language of the county of Westfriesland in Holland is essentially phonetic in character. The phonetic differences between the various dialects are represented graphically in 67 small maps in addition to a large one showing the whole area in a great part of which only small enclaves remain in which Frisian is still spoken. That the work has been carefully done and is reliable is evident from the control methods the author has employed, one of which I wish especially to call attention to, mentioned on page xiv of the Introduction: "die, toen ik mijn werk bij gedeelten in het Leeuwarder Nieuwsblad deed verschijnen (vooral met het doel, de verzamelde feiten een tijdlang onder 'publieke controle' te stellen) mij konden gerieven met welkome aanvullingen en verbeteringen." That such a procedure is of the greatest importance in the matter of studies in modern dialects is apparent to every one. Especially interesting and valuable for the Germanic philologist and for the student of dialects in general is the for the most part successful attempt to discover the origin and trace the direction of the sound changes discussed.

E. H. SEHRT

George Washington University

---

*The Social Criticism of Fenimore Cooper.* By JOHN E. ROSS. University of California Publications in English, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 17-118. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933. \$1.50. Dr. Ross has added to the recent discussions of Fenimore Cooper's social and political ideas an essay which shows grasp of essentials and logic of exposition rather than novelty or thoroughness of analysis. His main points are sound: that Cooper was a critic by temperament and a writer of romance by accident; that his apparent change in attitude after his return from Europe in 1833 was more a change in the times than in the man; and that his

social criticism, although not radical in theory, was directed against many factors in American life which persist today. Dr. Ross has stated his case with admirable clarity, and, by an analysis of the *Notions of the Americans*, *The American Democrat*, *The Monikins*, *Home as Found*, and *The Sea Lions*, has begun to fill in his generalizations with judgment. But his treatment of the great bulk of Cooper's work, particularly of the later novels of manners and social history, is inadequate; his knowledge of the background of the times is based almost wholly on secondary sources; and his discussions of the personal controversies in which the irate critic engaged in his later years is cursory. The monograph makes a good introduction to the subject, but its contribution lies in its interpretive rather than in its analytical power.

ROBERT E. SPILLER

*Swarthmore College*

---

*Aspects of Shakespeare: Being British Academy Lectures.* By L. ABERCROMBIE, E. K. CHAMBERS, H. GRANVILLE-BARKER, W. W. GREG, E. LEGOUIS, A. W. POLLARD, C. F. E. SPURGEON, A. [H.] THORNDIKE, and J. D. WILSON. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. vii + 286. \$3.75. These are the lectures from 1923 to 1931. Since nearly all appeared as brochures, one need here but remind the reader of the first-rate importance of Mr. Pollard's pronunciamiento (1923) on "The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text," of Sir Edmund Chambers's defence of the accepted canon in "The Disintegration of Shakespeare," of Mr. Granville-Barker's plea ("From 'Henry V' to 'Hamlet'") for clearer recognition of the contribution which can be made by further examination (and, if possible, exemplification) of histrionic considerations, and of Dr. Greg's exposition ("Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare") of the interdependence of emendation and textual theory.

H. S.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

LONGFELLOW "UNDISCOVERED." I regret to learn that the bit of verse from Longfellow that I contributed to the last number of *MLN* as a "hitherto undiscovered" poem entitled *The River* is in reality three stanzas from *The River Charles* and consequently appears in the author's collected poems.

ESTHER C. AVERILL

5 Rupert Street,  
Worcester, Mass.

## NECROLOGY

DAVID S. BLONDHEIM

The Editors of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES express in these lines their sorrow over the sudden death on March 19 of their colleague, David S. Blondheim. Born in Baltimore in 1884, he was long closely associated with The Johns Hopkins University as student and teacher. He received his A. B. degree there in 1906, his Ph. D. in 1910; he held the Romance fellowship in 1909-10, was a Johnston scholar in 1913-14, became a member of the faculty in 1917, and was made Professor of Romance Philology in 1924. He had taught at the University of Illinois in 1910-17. He was an advisory editor of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES from 1917 to the time of his death.

While the articles and reviews that he published in leading Romance journals, the dissertations he directed, and the undertakings he helped to organize show that he had a wide range of interests, including the history of culture and of literature, syntax, etymology, the constitution of texts, and lexicography, his main contributions to knowledge were in a single field, that of Judeo-Romance. Here he continued the work of Arsène Darmesteter and became the leading authority in the world on the subject. His principal publications were: *Contribution à la lexicographie française d'après des sources rabbiniques*; *Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers judéo-romans*; *Les Parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus latina*; *Poèmes judéo-français du moyen âge*; *Les Gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi*; *Liste des manuscrits des commentaires bibliques de Raschi*. These studies threw much light both on the history of the French language and on the culture and vocabulary of Medieval Jews. It is most unfortunate that he was unable to finish his study of Raschi's Biblical glosses, but it is hoped that some two hundred of them, the investigation of which he had completed, may before long be published.

Romance scholars will all feel the loss of his stimulating and exacting scholarship, and he will be especially missed by those who depended upon his vast knowledge and sound judgment in matters of linguistic history. He had a remarkably keen mind, an extraordinary knowledge of languages, and a great zest for exploring regions that had seldom been visited before his time. American scholars may well take pride in his achievement. They will deeply regret the loss of what in twenty more years of labor he might have accomplished.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Allen, Ralph Bergen.—Old Icelandic Source in the English Novel. Diss. *Philadelphia*: 1933. Pp. 122.

Buck, Philo M., Jr. (ed.).—An Anthology of World Literature. *New York*: Macmillan 1934. Pp. xii + 1016. \$4.00.

De Vane, William Clyde (ed.).—The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1934. Pp. xxiv + 390. \$1.25.

Eccles, Mark.—Christopher Marlowe in London. *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 186. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in Eng., X.)

Gebert, Clara.—An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications and Prefaces. Diss. *Philadelphia*: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1933. Pp. x + 302.

Grenfell, Sir Wilfred.—The Romance of Labrador. *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. xvi + 330. \$4.00.

Harrold, Charles Frederick.—Carlyle and German Thought. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 346. \$2.50. (Yale Studies in Eng., LXXXII.)

Hoops, Reinald.—Der Einfluss der Psychoanalyse auf die englische Literatur. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. Pp. viii + 340. 10 M. (Anglistische Forschungen, 77.)

Kern, John Dwight.—Constance Fenimore Woolson. Diss. *Philadelphia*: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 198.

Nangle, Benjamin Christie.—The Monthly Review, First Series, 1749-1789, Indexes of Contributors and Articles. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 256. \$5.00.

Ramsay, Robert; Read, Allen; Leech, Esther.—Introduction to a Survey of Missouri Place-Names. *Columbia*: Univ. of Missouri, 1934. Pp. 124. \$1.25. (The Univ. of Missouri Studies.)

Stein, Harold.—Studies in Spenser's Complaints. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 196. \$2.50.

## GERMAN

Bach, Adolf.—Deutsche Mundartenforschung. Ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Eine Einführung. [Germanische Bibliothek, 1. Abt. Sammlung germanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, 1. Reihe, Bd. 18]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. xiv, 179 pp. M. 6.50.

Bescher, Hermann.—Die Grundlagen der Mundartgeographie des südlichen Rheinhessens. Diss. *Giessen*: 1933. 57 pp.

Bretschneider, Anneliese.—Die Heliand-heimat und ihre sprachgeschichtliche Entwicklung [Deutsche Dialektgeographie. H. 30]. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1934. vii, 322 pp. M. 16.80.

Castle, Eduard.—Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch z. Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung in österreich-Ungarn. Nach dem Tode von Joh. Willibald Nagl u. Jakob Zeidler hrsg. Dritter (Schluss-) Band, 1848-1918. 11. Abt. *Wien*: Carl Fromme, 1934. Pp. 1593-1752.

Claus, Horst.—Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Frühnaturalismus. Die deutsche Literatur von 1880-1890. Diss. Greifswald. *Halle*: Akademischer Verlag, 1933. 100 pp. M. 3.80.

Cordes, Gerhard.—Schriftwesen und Schriftsprache in Goslar bis zur Aufnahme der nhd. Schriftsprache. [Sprache u. Volkstum. 3]. *Hamburg*: Wachholtz, 1934. xii, 117 pp. 4<sup>e</sup>. M. 3.

Cruse, Ulrich.—August Lewald und seine zeitgeschichtliche Bedeutung. [Sprache u. Kultur d. germ.-roman. Völker. Reihe B, Bd. 6]. *Breslau*: H. Priebsch, 1933. 118 pp. M. 4.

Dippel, Paul Gerhardt.—Nietzsche und Wagner. Eine Untersuchung über die Grundlagen und Motive ihrer Trennung. [Sprache und Dichtung. H. 54]. *Bern*: Haupt, 1934. 100 pp. M. 3.20.

Elster, Hanns Martin.—Ernst von Wildenbruch. Leben, Werk, Persönlichkeit. *Berlin*: Grote, 1934. 96 pp. M. 1.

Fink, Fritz.—Friedr. Joh. Justin Bertuch. Der Schöpfer des Weimarer Landes-Industrie-Comptoirs (1747-1822). [Persönlichkeiten des klassischen Weimar. H. 1 = Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Stadt Weimar. H. 35/36]. *Weimar*: Fink, 1934. 32 pp. M. 1.

— Carl Ludwig Fernow. Der Bibliothekar der Herzogin Anna Amalia. (1763-1808). [Persönlichkeiten des klassischen Weimar. H. 2 = Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Stadt Weimar. H. 37/38]. *Weimar*: Fink, 1934. 30 pp. M. 1.

Freiwald, Curt.—Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Landschaftserlebnis im Wandel seiner dichterischen Gestalt. Diss. *Kiel*: 1933. 175 pp.

Güntert, Hermann.—Der Ursprung der Germanen. [Kultur u. Sprache. Bd. 9]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. 192 pp. M. 3.

Habetin, Rudolf.—Die Lyrik Hölderlins im Verhältnis zur Lyrik Goethes und Schillers. Diss. Leipzig. *Schwarzenberg, Sachsen*: Gärtner, 1933. 63 pp.

Hain, Mathilde.—Studien über das Wesen des frühexpressionistischen Dramas. [Frankfurter Quellen u. Forschungen zur german. u. roman. Philologie. H. 5]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1933. 102 pp. M. 3.20.

Hilpert, Walter.—Johann Georg Hamann als Kritiker der deutschen Literatur. Diss. *Königsberg*: 1933. 141 pp.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von.—Briefe an Joh. Gottfried Schweighäuser. Zum ersten Mal nach d. Orig. hrsg. u. erl. von Albert Leitzmann. [Jenaer germanistische Forschungen. 25]. *Jena*: Frommann, 1934. 82 pp. M. 3.80.

Kaufmann, Fritz.—Sprache als Schöpfung. Zur absoluten Kunst im Hinblick auf Rilke. [S.-A. aus Zs. f. Ästhetik u. allg. Kunstwissenschaft. Bd. 28]. *Stuttgart*: Enke, 1934. 54 pp. 4°. M. 2.50.

Langen, August.—Anschauungsformen in der deutschen Dichtung des 18. Jhs. (Rahmenschau und Rationalismus) [= Deutsche Arbeiten der Univ. Köln]. *Jena*: Diederichs, 1934. 131 pp. M. 6.

Milch, Werner.—Hermann Stehr. Seine dichterische Welt und ihre Probleme. *Berlin*: Goldstein, 1934. 57 pp. M. 2.

Notkers des Deutschen Werke nach den Handschriften neu hrsg. von E. H. Sehrst und Taylor Starck. Ersten Bandes drittes Heft: Boethius de consolatione philosophiae IV/V. [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek No. 34]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. 245-403. M. 4.

Reimers, Armin.—Die Gefährdung der Familiengemeinschaft durch den Individualismus in Aug. Wilh. Ifflands Dramen von 1781 bis 1811. Diss. Kiel. *Quakenbrück*: Kleinert, 1933. 114 pp.

Schröbler, Ingeborg.—Wikingische und spielmännische Elemente im zweiten Teile des Gudrunliedes. [Rheinische Beiträge u. Hilfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie u. Volkskunde, Bd. 20]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. xxiv, 111 pp. M. 4.80.

Schütze, Georg.—Das Naturgefühl um die Mitte des 18. Jhs. in der Lyrik von Pyra bis Claudius. Diss. *Leipzig*: Frommhold & Wendler, 1933. 169 pp. typewritten.

Schwarz, Bertha.—Das Gottesbild in höfischer Dichtung. *Bonn*: Cohen, 1933. vii, 120 pp. M. 2.50.

Stöckli, Alban.—Hartmann von Aue. Neue Ergebnisse der Forschung. *Basel*: Gebr. Hess in Komm., 1933. 75 pp. Fr. 2.80.

Tarlach, Hans.—Veit Weber und seine Dichtungen. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des 15. Jh. Diss. *Greifswald*: Adler, 1933. 115 pp.

Wesly, Margot.—Das junge Mädchen im deutschen Roman des 18. Jhs. bis zum Beginn des Sturm und Dranges. (Unter bes. Berücksichtigung des gleichzeitigen französischen und englischen Romans). Diss. *Leipzig*: 1933. 96 pp.

Wortig, Ilse.—Der "Wendepunkt" in der neuen deutschen Novelle und seine Gestaltung. Diss. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Schröder, 1933. 55 pp.

## FRENCH

Beauchêne, Paul de.—La Maison de Racine. *Paris*: Picard, 1934. 95 pp. Fr. 15.

Calvet, J.—Polyeucte, de Corneille, étude et analyse. *Paris*: Mellottée, 1933. 319 pp.

Charreyron, P.—La famille limousine de V. Hugo. *Limoges*: Soc. du Centre, 1933. 28 pp.

Enfances Guillaume, chanson de geste du XIII<sup>e</sup> s., éd. J. L. Perrier. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933. ix + 151 pp.

Feuillerat, A.—Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman. *New Haven*: Yale Press, 1934. 314 pp. \$2.50.

Gazier, Cécile.—Mme de Sévigné. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1934. 224 pp. Fr. 12.

Ghisalberti, F.—L' "Ovidius moralizatus" di Pierre Bersuire. *Rome*: Tip. Cuggiani, 1933. 136 pp.

Gigli, L.—Vita di Gobineau. *Milano*: V. Bompiani, 1933. 307 pp. L. 10.

Gobineau et Prokesch-Osten.—Corresp., éd. C. Serpeille. *Paris*: Plon, 1933. vii + 411 pp.

Grosclaude, P.—La Vie intellectuelle à Lyon dans la deuxième moitié du XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris*: Picard, 1933. ii + 467 pp. Fr. 40.

Guddorf, H.—Der Stil Flauberts. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. 85 pp.

Güllecke, K.-H.—Der Einfluss Tolstojs auf das franz. Geistesleben. Diss. *Bonn*: 1933. 74 pp.

Haschke, F.—Die Sprache Richelieus. *Paris*: Droz, 1934.

Henriot, E.—Courrier litt. XVII<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933. 237 pp. Fr. 12.

Hilka, A.—Eine altfranz. moralisierende Bearbeitung des Liber de monstrosis hominibus orientis aus Thomas von Cantimpré. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1933. 73 pp.

Hugo.—Ruy Blas, éd. M. Levailant. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1933. 228 pp.

Jäckel, K.—Bergson und Proust. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1934. 129 pp. Rm. 6. (Sprache u. Kultur der Germ.-Rom. Völker.)

Jäger, M.—Die Erzählungstechnik R. Rollands im "Jean-Christophe." *Münster*: Rom. Sem., 1933. iv + 43 pp.

Jördens, W.—Die franz. Ödipusdramen. *Bochum-Langendreer*: H. Pöppinghaus, 1934. 149 pp.

Korwin-Piotrowska.—Balzac et le monde slave. 2 vols. *Paris*: Champion, 1934. 519 + 120 pp. Fr. 80. (Bibl. de la RLC.)

Maranini, Lorenza.—Proust. Arte e conoscenza. *Firenze*: "Novissima," 1933. ix + 273 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca di lettere.)

Montaigne.—Selected Essays, ed. A. Tilley and A. M. Boase. *Manchester*: Univ. Press, 1934. xxix + 252 pp. 4/6.



Neumann, H. — Das Deutschland-Erlebnis bei E. Quinet. *Hamburg*: Rom. Sem., 1933. 95 pp.

Osterwalder, T. — Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Dialektes von Magland (Hochsavoyen). *Leipzig*: Rom. Sem., 1933. 85 pp.

Oxford rapid-reading Fr. texts based on word-frequency: H. Bernay, *L'Armure du Magyar* (62 pp.), *Chasseurs de papillons* (63 pp.), *Le Solopendre* (64 pp.), L. Boutinon, *La Mission de Slim Kerrigan* (60 pp.) (ed. Scott and Storey); V. Bonhoure, *Un Drame sous la régence* (64 pp., ed. C. S. Musgrave); H. Bacon, *Cica, la Fille du bandit* (64 pp., ed. L. Humphreys); M. Leblanc, *Carafe d'eau*, etc. (64 pp., ed. R. W. Hartland); E. de Riche, *Le Raid fantastique* (64 pp., ed. A. Rose); G. Leroux, *Le Mystère de la chambre jaune* (64 pp., ed. A. Owen); A. Dumas, *La Prisonnière du Temple* (64 pp., ed. Ducroix and Herbert); M. Dekobra, *Ma Princesse chérie* (64 pp., ed. R. W. Hartland); H. Cauvain, *L'Aiguille qui tue* (64 pp., ed. P. W. Packer). *New York and London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932-4. Each \$0.40.

Platz, W. — Renouvier als Kritiker der franz.: Kultur. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1934. 128 pp.

Porciani, JoLe. — Sulla questione del "Misanthrope" di Molière. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1933. 21 pp.

Praviel, A. — Le Roman douloureux d'A. de Vigny. *Paris*: Edit. de France. Fr. 15.

Radmann, L. — Der Stil C. Marots. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 93 pp.

Ranyard, R. — La Découverte des restes de Ronsard. *Paris*: Sauvegarde de l'art fr., 1933. 25 pp. Fr. 5.

Reichenburg, Marguerite. — Essai sur les lectures de Rousseau. Diss. *Philadelphia*: 1932. 210 pp.

Röder, J. — Das Fürstenbild in den mittelalterlichen Fürstenspiegeln auf franz.: Boden. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. 98 pp.

Roya, M. — Le plus grand amour de G. Sand. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1933. xii + 188 pp. Fr. 20.

Rudolf, P. — Frankreich im Urteil der Hamburger Zeitschriften in den Jahren 1789-1810. *Hamburg*: Rom. Sem., 1934. viii + 63 pp.

Sardou. — Mme Sans-Gêne, ed. D. C. Cabeen. *New York*: Holt, 1934. xiii + 168 + xlv pp. \$0.96.

Schneider, C. — L'Activité litt. en Alsace et en Lorraine depuis la guerre. *Bordeaux*: Eds. de la Renaissance provinciale, 1933. 48 pp.

Sée, E. — Notre époque et le théâtre. *Paris*: Eds. de Fr., 1933. 355 pp. Fr. 15.

Seillière, E. — Sur la psychologie du romantisme fr. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933. 260 pp. Fr. 15.

Storer, M. E. — Contes de fées du Grand Siècle. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1934. 182 pp.

Strentz, H. — G. de Nerval. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933. 93 pp. Fr. 9.

Telger, G. — Die altfranz.: Gregoriuslegende. *Münster*: Rom. Sem., 1933. 135 pp.

Vianey, J. — Les Poèmes barbares de Leconte de Lisle. *Paris*: Malfère, 1934. 204 pp. Fr. 12.

Voltaire. — Candide, ed. G. R. Havens. *New York*: Holt, 1934. lxiii + 149 + lxi pp. \$1.00.

Wilmotte, M. — Le Poème du Gral. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 93 pp.

Winkler, E. G. — Moderne franz.: Klassiker-aufführungen auf Pariser Bühnen. Diss. *München*: 1933. 52 pp.

## ITALIAN

Acerbi, Giuseppe. — Un diario di viaggio di —: Roma-Napoli, 9 ottobre-12 novembre 1834. A cura di Emma Tedeschi. *Mantova*: Stab. tip. "L'artistica," di C. Gobbi, 1933. 65 pp.

Ariosto, Ludovico. — Orlando furioso. Edizione integra. Introduzione, testo, argomenti, indice copiosissimo, a cura di N. Zingarelli. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1934. lxxv + 600 pp. L. 28.

Alighieri, Dante. — La Divina Commedia. Con brevi note di L. Pietrobono. *Torino*: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1933. 746 pp. L. 10.

Bisanti, Nina. — Giovanni Alcezer, poeta siciliano. *Palermo*: F.lli Corselli, 1933. 112 pp.

Cione, E. — Francesco De Sanctis dalla Nunziatella a Castel dell'Ovo. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1933. 62 pp. L. 10. (Repr. fr. the "Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane," vol. 58.)

Cremona-Casoli, A. — Chi è l' "Adoardo" dell'Orlando furioso (canto XLVI, stanza 18\*). *Reggio Emilia*: Offic. graf. fasciste, 1933. 16 pp. (Repr. fr. "Il soleo fascista," 1933.)

Facchinetti, V. — S. Bernardino da Siena mistico sole del secolo XV. *Milano*: Casa ed. S. Lega eucaristica, 1933. xxiv + 611 pp.

Fatini, G. — Letteratura marenmanna delle origini. *Siena*: Lazzeri, 1933. 107 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Bullettino senese di storia patria," nuova serie 1932, fasc. II, e 1933, fasc. I.)

Fletcher, J. B. — Literature of the Italian Renaissance. *New York*: The Macmillan Co., 1934. 347 pp. \$3.00.

Flora, F. — Novelle italiane dal XIV al XX

secolo, scelte e commentate ad uso delle scuole da —. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1933. 320 pp. L. 10.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Il burbero benefico. Commedia in tre atti. A cura di P. Colombo. *Palermo*: S. Andò e figli, 1933. 112 pp. L. 2.50. (Scrittori italiani, no. 2.)

— La locandiera. Introduzione e commento di O. Castellino. *Torino*: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1933. xii + 81 pp. L. 3. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Lipparini, G.—I grandi autori della letteratura italiana. Luoghi scelti dalle opere, con introduzioni, sunti di storia letteraria e commenti ad uso delle scuole medie superiori. Volume II: Parini, Alfieri, Goldoni, Monti, Foscolo. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 287 pp. L. 6.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Liriche: Inni sacri, odi politiche, cori. Con l'interpretazione di G. De Robertis. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. 48 pp. L. 3.

Milazzo, Antonina.—G. Verga e il suo "Mastro don Gesualdo." *Catania*: Zuccarello e Izzi, 1933. 180 pp. L. 12.

Momigliano, A.—Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. I: Dalle origini al Tasso. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1933. 289 pp. L. 8

Nievo, Ippolito.—Le confessioni di un italiano. Pagine scelte e ricollegate con introduzione e note di A. Mareduzzo. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 222 pp. L. 5. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 41.)

Pasoli, L.—La personalità di Scipione Maffei e lo svolgimento dei suoi studi storici sino alla "Verona illustrata." *Venezia*: C. Ferrari, 1929. 86 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Archivio veneto," 1929.)

Peluso, G., e Ronci, L.—Fiesole e i poeti. Prefazione di U. Signorini. *Firenze*: Edizione del Gruppo di cultura fiorentino degl'Isvici, 1933. 61 pp. L. 5.

Piancastelli, C.—Saggio di una bibliografia delle tradizioni popolari della Romagna. I: Usi, costumi, credenze, pregiudizi. *Bologna*: Stab. poligr. riuniti, 1933. 112 pp.

Pindemonte, Ippolito.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da G. B. Angioletti. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1933. vii + 311 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 61.)

Segneri, Paolo.—Il quaresimale. *Alba-Roma*: Pia soc. S. Paolo, 1933. 376 pp.

Serafino, Giuseppina Maria.—Le donne dell'Orlando Furioso. *Palermo*: "Il popolo di Sicilia," 1933. 114 pp. L. 8.

Vaccaluzzo, N.—Un accademico burlesco contro un accademico togato, ossia Carlo Gozzi contro Melchior Cesarotti. Scritti inediti sulla lingua italiana e su' doveri accademici. *Livorno*: R. Giusti. xxxviii + 171 pp. L. 12.

Weidlich, C.—Nella repubblica delle lettere. *Palermo*: Casa edit. Domino, 1933. 198 pp. L. 5.

### SPANISH

Aroche, C. L.—Los mejores madrigales en español. *México*: Edit. Nacionalista, 1933. 190 pp.

Carmody, F. J.—Franco-Italian sources of Roncesvalles. *New York*: Columbia University, 1934. 33 pp.

Cuevas, M.—Orígenes del humanismo en Méjico. *Méjico*: Esc. Tip. Salesiana, 1933. 74 pp.

Chabás, J.—Historia de la Literatura española. *Barcelona*: Gil, 1933. 83 pp. 4 ptas.

Ercilla y Zúñiga, A. de.—La Araucana. 2 vols. *Santiago de Chile*: Ed. Universidad de Chile, 1933. xxix + 309 y 412 pp.

Góngora y Argote, L. de.—Obras completas. Ed. de J. e I. Millé y Giménez. *Madrid*: Aguilar, [1932]. xxxv + 1343 pp. 25 ptas.

Haynes, R. A.—Negation in *Don Quijote*. *Chicago*: The University of Chicago Libraries, 1933. xi + 167 pp.

Ibarra, J. F.—Los días y las estaciones. *Buenos Aires*: Tip. Futura, 1932. 264 pp. (Importante a causa de la métrica.)

Irizar y Avilés, P. de.—Sinónimos. Repertorio de palabras usuales castellanas de sentido análogo, semejante o aproximado. 5ª ed. aumentada por H. Seris. *Barcelona*: Seix & Barral, 1932. 151 pp. 4 ptas.

Marañón, G.—El Empeinado. *Madrid*: Ed. Castón, 1932. 176 pp. 1 pta.

Martorell, R.—Trece crónicas de viajes. Por China, Mongolia, Japón, Filipinas, Bali, Siam y la India. *Madrid*: Maestre, 1933. 485 pp. 20 ptas.

Palacio Valdés, A.—Tiempos felices. Escenas de la época esponsalicia. *Madrid*: Suárez, 1933. 289 pp. 5 ptas.

Rubio, D.—La Universidad de San Marcos de Lima durante la colonización española. *Madrid*: Imp. Juan Bravo, 1933. 257 pp.

Silva Castro, R.—Fuentes bibliográficas para el estudio de la Literatura Chilena. *Santiago de Chile*: prensas de la Universidad, 1933. 272 pp.

Smith, W. V. and R. L. Grismer.—Tales of the Spanish Southwest. *New York*: Holt, 1934. xi + 181 + 1. \$0.96.

Spanisches Theater.—*Berlin*: Preussische Staatsbibliothek, 1928. (Catálogo de 9000 comedias, la mayor parte de los siglos XIX y XX.)

Usigli, R.—Méjico en el teatro. *Méjico*: Imp. Mundial, 1932. 220 pp.

Vitis, M. D. de.—Florilegio del Parnaso Americano. *Barcelona*: Maucci, 1933? 577 pp.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIX

NOVEMBER, 1934

Number 7

---

## THE *BEAU MONDE* AT THE RESTORATION

Since my other discussions of the subject, I have come upon Miss Kathleen Lynch's *Social Mode of Restoration Comedy* (1926), one of the most discriminating dissertations I remember to have read. Miss Lynch does not much undertake to discover sources or trace influences, matters too often undiscernible or unascertainable, but explores the less dubious or illusory course of tradition and development. And this she does, I think successfully, in the case of the Restoration Comedy of Manners, or of the *beau monde*. It takes its rise not out of French comedy, though somewhat affected by it, but the late Jacobean and Early Caroline, and flows from Fletcher, Shirley, and Brome through Suckling and Davenant, Killigrew and Cowley down to Dryden, Etherege, Wycherley, and the rest.

As she pursues the subject Miss Lynch in her forbearance is less discreet. She does not much consider whether this comedy, containing so many traditional and conventional elements, is to be accounted a fairly faithful reflection of Restoration high society; but she strangely (as I think) inclines to do so. She "turns gratefully" to Mr. John Palmer as a critic of the Restoration comedy, and that is his thesis. She seems to take a change in English society itself to be the cause or occasion for the change in comedy; and is of the opinion that the Restoration dramatists accepted the heritage from Shirley and Suckling because of its fitness for the representation of contemporary life. Now expression framed before the object itself came into being can scarcely be very fit; and what Miss Lynch means may be something such as I have suggested, a drama only colored, so to speak, not drawn, from the life at hand. At any rate Miss Lynch's investigations seem to support such an opinion.

The writer defines the Restoration comedy of manners with greater technical exactitude than has been done hitherto. It is a gay satire on social relations, involving a contrast between the true *beau monde* and the false—between young ladies and gentlemen, on the one hand, and parvenus or affected folk on the other, between the pseudo-wit and the true-wit (male or female), the jealous man and the wittol, the prude and the libertine, as well as between the larger matters of country and town. But in Restoration comedy, as not in Molière, there is a double scope. The members of the *beau monde* are themselves the objects of satire, in so far as they are social more than human beings, beaux more than gentlemen, coquettes more than ladies. And to this end certain typical situations or bits of comic machinery continually recur: wit combats, whether between the professionals on the one hand or between lovers on the other, with lavish use of "similitudes" and fanciful ingenuities on the part of either set, and bargains, with "provisos" for their individual liberty, like Mirabel's and Millamant's, on the part of the latter. Wit, indeed, abounds, and much of it is discharged in rebellion against the conventional morality, and (it would seem) in the celebration of another, the *beau monde's* own.

Now the striking thing about this art form is its development. In its elements, in typical situation and animating spirit, it arose a generation before the Restoration society—the "golden moment" of Mr. Palmer, which it is supposed to mirror—came into being; it was perfected, in Congreve, only after that age had fairly passed away; it came to an end, in Vanbrugh and Farquhar, after the reign of William and Mary, several years after the accession of Anne. It realized itself slowly and gradually: step by step the central idea of high society and "good form" eliminated the extraneous elements of the broader and humaner Elizabethan comedy, with its elements of "random adventure and farcical intrigue," and (in some measure) leavened the whole. Thus the development is similar to that of other art forms; as, to speak of things far more momentous, Gothic Architecture. How long it took for the "cage à jour," a system of thrusts and counter-thrusts, with piers and buttresses (not walls) for structure, sustaining a fabric of stone high in air, to be born out of the Romanesque four walls and wooden roof! In drama things move, indeed, less slowly; but how

long it took for the Elizabethan comedy of humours, out of the decay of which the Comedy of Manners itself sprang, to develop out of the native interlude and the Latin comic intrigue! There is more of imitation and representation in drama than in architecture and a closer connection with contemporary life; but in all these cases the artistic evolution and realization, once under way, proceeded rather out of a germinal principle, from an inner necessity. The minds of the artists found no repose or respite until the possibilities of the structure had been explored and exploited, until the artistic conception which haunted them had been fully expressed.

So it was, it seems to me, with the Restoration Comedy of Manners, which, so far as realism is concerned, might better be called Early Caroline. In its beginnings, under Henrietta Maria, its connections with the life of the time seem considerably closer. And it may well be (though on drama I would not rely to prove it) that a *beau monde* was now for the first time arising, which comedy must take account of. It may well be that class distinctions, resting on birth and wealth, were breaking down, and those resting on refinement of manners were replacing them.<sup>1</sup> But I think it far more likely that even in Elizabeth's time there was, of its sort, a *beau monde*, too, and that comedy now began to deal more with manners and fashions because, under the growing Puritanical disapproval, it was depending more upon the small fashionable world for support and favor. And I think it likelier still that comedy now began to develop into high comedy, of social satire and raillery,—because this it had not done before. The possibilities, mentioned above, now opened up—the field worked by the great Elizabethans and Jacobeans was, for the time, exhausted. The dramatists, in order to get a hearing, in order even to have something quite of their own to say, must turn in this or some other direction; and this direction, apparently, was that of least resistance. The comedy of Jonson had been, as Miss Lynch says, one of morals and common sense; this of “good form” and “bad form” remained. And with these younger dramatists in relation to the older the situation is somewhat as with those pairs of contemporaries continually reappearing in the history of culture—Browning and Tennyson,

<sup>1</sup> Miss Lynch, p. 28, and chapter III.

Dickens and Thackeray, Hardy and Meredith, Björnson and Ibsen, Raphael and Michelangelo, Æschylus and Sophocles, Shakespeare and Jonson, Wycherley and Congreve themselves,—in subject and style how, even in their likeness, they always differ and must! There is no chance for them unless they do. *That*, for the most part, is the outcome of the “influence” of one upon the other.

The spirit of innovation prompted the rise of the Comedy of Manners: the spirit of conservatism, equally important, preserved it, until, in turn, its possibilities were exhausted. This is true generally of popular art, unlike the highbrow art of the present. Within the established medium the artist reaches his public more readily, so long as within it novelty or variety remains possible. Blank verse held the Elizabethan stage until there was no new and beautiful way of writing it and it was scarcely distinguishable from prose; then perforce came prose or rime. Something similar may be said of both the form and the substance of the sonnet and the popular ballad in the same age; and of medieval epic and architecture. Gothic was built till there was no new and beautiful way left to build it. So the Comedy of Manners ran its course, through the respectable reign of William and Mary, even into the moral reign of Anne.

As for the “new ethics,” the anti-morality which, like Mr. Palmer, Miss Lynch finds in the Comedy of Manners, I do not, as I have said before,<sup>2</sup> see how it can be considered to be the “code” observed in that day, even by the gallants. These are not problem plays, but comedies; and the immoral sentiments uttered are meant to be startling, to be witty. Partly because they are startling are they witty and comic. “Constancy at my years?” cries young Dorimant in Etherege’s *Man of Mode*, “’tis not a virtue in season. You might as well expect the Fruit the Autumn ripens in the Spring.” “Monstrous principle,” cries Loveit in reply, and morality looms up in the background, not forgotten. Not that the dramatist is on her side, either; for this is a comedy. But it is because it is comedy, not tragedy, that he is more on the gallant’s side than are Beaumont and Fletcher on that of Evadne when she cries, “A maidenhead, Amintor, at my years?” to her husband in their bridal chamber. As in literature generally, there is in-

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare Studies* (1927), chapter II.

dulgence for a young rake's audacity, if merry enough. Sometimes, indeed, in their epigrammatic exaggeration, the sentiments contain at bottom some real criticism of the hard-and-fast morality of the day; but oftener they are the ribald defiance of a reckless gallant. With him it is no anti-morality, no new code of his own or his set; but the contumacy of one who knows or acknowledges the old. The effect of his speeches is owing to the contrast. In neither case is there what can be called any serious and considered presentation of the morals, or manners, of gallantry, like that of chivalry at the courts of love.

Nor are the sex duels and proviso scenes, as between Mirabel and Millamant, penned in the style, for all their wit, of the colloquies on sexual privilege and enfranchisement in Shaw and Barker. They are not deficient in sense or wholly wanting in seriousness: but they are prompted by no principle and arrive at no conclusion. The dramatists generally have some notions of liberty and enlightenment, but they do not make these pervade the play. In the proviso scenes the dramatic and sentimental interests prevail; the wit combats are love combats; and the frailties and follies of the lovers so outweigh their virtues and principles that we wonder whether, and how, they can agree. Mirabel and Millamant are wooing as they thrust and parry; she is tempting him as she retreats.

If the "new ethics" were at all serious, were as Mr. Palmer says, "an actual and definite code of morality," surely jealousy, the chief vice or folly of the proprietary system, would have been consistently exposed, as indeed Mr. Palmer thinks it is.<sup>3</sup> Really, it is treated pretty much as in other comedy before and after; only rakes and flirts are free of it, and these not altogether; and though the sensible and virtuous but not delicate Alithea in the *Country Wife* would have no jealous husband, it is because she would not put up with the annoyance and interference. She feels justified in deserting her fiancé Sparkish only when he betrays this weakness; but that she seizes upon as an excuse, for she was disgusted with him (even because, with provocation, he had not sense enough to be jealous) before that. Sparkish's jealousy, failing or asserting

<sup>3</sup> Cf. "Comedy of Manners," pp. 129-30; and my *Shakespeare Studies*, pp. 48-50.

itself, is simply a dramatic device to point the contrast between Alithea and her brother. Pinchwife, in his jealousy, is made ridiculous and a butt, but he would have been both the one and the other, in comedy or in life, whether before or since the days of the Merry Monarch.

For ideas we must not look too obstinately in our early drama, whether the dramatist's own or those of his age. Even the simple central one, that of a contrast between the true *beau monde* and the false, is far from all-pervading. These are comedies mainly of intrigue and amour; and how much space in them is given to what by no conceivable extension of the term can be considered a *beau monde*, false or true! The grossness and vulgarity, and not only of the supposedly fashionable but also of the obviously sordid and disreputable world, that there is in plays such as Etherege's *She Would if She Could*, Wycherley's *Country Wife* and *Plain Dealer*, and even, too often, in Congreve! The impudence and scurrility, the outrageous pranks and impostures,<sup>4</sup> the continual marrying of objectionable men to prostitutes or objectionable women to fools, because such things were funny! Meredith declares the manners in the Comedy of Manners are those of South Sea Islanders under city veneer. If there is any comedy which approaches a picture of the Restoration *beau monde* it is the *Way of the World*. Millamant, however, alone will do. Mirabel comes as near, perhaps, to being a gentleman as any hero in the Restoration drama; but could he, if indeed Millamant could have had such an aunt, or have been living with her, have done anything so outrageous or senseless as to pretend to make love to her himself, in the first place, and get her entangled with his valet as "Sir Rowland," in the second, and both alike in order that he might bring her to the point of permitting their marriage? But if Mirabel's conduct had been more

<sup>4</sup>In the matter of fraudulent marriages of a rake to a virtuous beauty I am glad to have the suffrage of Professor Lascelles Abercrombie, *Progress in Literature* (1929), p. 23: "Professor G. M. Trevelyan, has, I know lately given us a striking story of Restoration life rivalling the plot of a Restoration play. But I think it is only because it does this that it seems characteristic of the time; it might have occurred at any time. See letters in the *Times Literary Supplement* Jan. 5 and March 1, 1928." I have dealt with this matter more at length in an unpublished article entitled "Literature and Life Once More," but somewhat in *PMLA*, March, 1932.



proper and probable we should not have had such striking situations in the process and the discovery, nor Lady Wishfort either delighting in endearments or writhing in a tantrum. What we have here and elsewhere is not the image of the *beau monde* but an entertainment to its taste,—a taste, in this instance, moreover, for something in drama farther removed from its own image than in the case of the contemporary *beau monde*, hard by the Louvre. For the morals and manners of Whitehall and Westminster are not, cannot be, to the morals and manners of the Louvre and Versailles, as are those in Wycherley and Congreve to those in Molière and Regnard.

"Life creates its traditions, and literature creates its traditions," says Professor Lascelles Abercrombie; "they are profoundly and subtly related; but they are not the same tradition." Yet it is the chief business and pleasure of the critic, it sometimes seems, and more strangely still of the historian, to confuse them. Fiction, in its relations, is not enough for the one; nor truth, in its relations, for the other. M. Baldensperger,<sup>5</sup> however, out of the abundance and profundity of his knowledge, declares that literature is, though an expression of society, not a description of it; that it does not so much reflect it as refract it, and magnify it; and that even the expression of society it can be only when taken as a whole. We know that the Comedy of Manners was played in two small theatres and much of the time only in one; that the runs were brief and the attendance slim; and that the number of playbooks printed from 1660 to 1670 was not more than two per centum of the publisher's output. Moreover, as M. Baldensperger also observes, with both Brunetière and Lemaître<sup>6</sup> to support him, the contemporary opinion of a literary work or of the *genre* must be reckoned in, which, in the case of the most striking achievement, even so unadventurous a sort as Corneille's and Molière's, is in some measure inhospitable; and in the case of the Comedy of Manners it was

<sup>5</sup> *Littérature* (1913), especially livre III, chapter 1; a book which I have come to know since writing the above essay and my others on the subject; discussions which, had I known the book before, I should probably not have penned.

<sup>6</sup> Nous connaissons les mœurs d'une époque beaucoup moins par les œuvres mêmes que par les jugements que les contemporains ont portés sur ces œuvres.

highly so. But, I remember, this is a matter, save for those who think loosely and speak carelessly, of the *beau monde*. And that the Comedy of Manners does reflect—in so far as that or any other mode of life can be truly mirrored in what is not a drama but a comedy, and a satire, and first and foremost not a document but a highly amusing entertainment, with fantastic and improbable situations, and with social and moral arrangements and principles, though near enough to the actual to be recognizable, pretty much upside down. It refracts instead of reflecting.

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

*University of Minnesota*

---

### THE EARL OF ROSCOMMON'S ACADEMY

Our knowledge of the Earl of Roscommon's society for the study and improvement of the English language has hitherto been derived from a few sentences in the memoir of Roscommon, which Elijah Fenton included as one of the notes in his edition of Waller's poems in 1729. Fenton says of the earl that "in imitation of those learned and polite assemblies, with which he had been acquainted abroad; particularly one at *Caen*, (in which his Tutor *Bochartus* dy'd suddenly, whilst he was delivering an Oration.) he began to form a Society for the refining, and fixing the standard of our language; in which design his great friend Mr. *Dryden* was a principal assistant. A design! of which it is much easier to conceive an agreeable idea, than any rational hope ever to see it brought to perfection among us. This project, at least, was entirely defeated by the religious commotions that ensu'd on King *James's* accession to the throne."<sup>1</sup> As to the date of the academy, Fenton says that the earl began the society after his return to London and his marriage with Lady Frances, the daughter of the Earl of Burlington.

In Fenton's account there are at least two errors. The earl's marriage to Lady Frances Boyle took place in April, 1662, in Ire-

<sup>1</sup> Elijah Fenton, *The Works of Edmund Waller* (London, 1730), pp. cxxxv-cxxxvi.

land,<sup>2</sup> and until her death, which must have occurred a decent length of time before November 9, 1674, when the earl secured a license to marry Isabella Boynton,<sup>3</sup> he was almost continuously in Ireland. A member of the Irish House of Lords, who attended sessions of the body with great regularity until 1666, when it ceased to meet,<sup>4</sup> he could scarcely have left Ireland to go off to found an academy.<sup>5</sup> It is much more reasonable to suppose that Fenton is referring to the second marriage, after which Roscommon did indeed live in London, except for brief absences, until his death in 1685. Fenton again errs when he implies that Roscommon abandoned his project because of the troubles attendant upon James II's reign; actually the earl never saw James king of England, for he died about January 17, 1685,<sup>6</sup> a good three weeks before the death of Charles II.

Much more satisfactory than Fenton's meager and inexact notes is a manuscript biography of the earl written by Knightley Chetwood (1650-1720), dean of Gloucester and a close friend of Roscommon a few years before the earl's death. A copy of this manuscript is in the library of Cambridge University;<sup>7</sup> it has never been printed, although in 1855 Thompson Cooper, the author of the *DNB* article on Roscommon, published a brief and incomplete summary of it in *The Gentleman's Magazine*.<sup>8</sup> The section concerning the academy is as follows:

This Storm blowing over, & one of these forfeited Estates being beg'd, by the most friendly Earle of Rochester, & presented to him, without his knowledge; he set himselfe, to form a sort of Academy, in Imitation of that at Caen. It seem'd a proper time for it, for things were in perfect Tranquillity; but it was like that profound Calm in the air, wch usually

<sup>2</sup> John Lodge, *The Peerage of Ireland* (London, 1789), iv, 165.

<sup>3</sup> J. L. Chester, *Allegations for Marriage Licenses issued by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, 1558-1679*, pp. 232-33.

<sup>4</sup> *Journals of the House of Lords of Ireland from 10 Car. I. 1634 to 40 Geo. III, 1800* (Dublin, 1779-1800), i, *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> In spite of all this Mr. B. S. Monroe in "An English Academy," *MP*. VIII (1910), 113, dated Roscommon's academy about 1662. He was relying on Dr. Johnson, whose biography of Roscommon is based on Fenton.

<sup>6</sup> Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Marquess of Ormonde*, New Series, vii, 313.

<sup>7</sup> Baker Ms. xxxvi, pp. 27-44. (The original seems to be lost; at least I have found no trace of it).

<sup>8</sup> *The Gentleman's Magazine* (December, 1855), XLIV, 603-05.

go's before Earth-quakes, & fiery Eruptions, as some naturalists observe. During this happy, but short Interval, good Men began to know one another better, there was then Friendship, english good-nature flourish'd, every spark of w<sup>ch</sup> ought to be preserv'd as carefully, as the Sacred Fire was by the Jews, during y<sup>e</sup> time of y<sup>r</sup> Captivity. Those who compos'd this little Body, were the Marquess of H., who undertook the Translation of Tacitus, an Author perfectly suited to his tast. He carried it on a good way, & corrected a great many Mistakes in the Version of Mr Ablancourt. The Lord Maitland was another, who then began his excellent Translation of Virgil. The E: of R. wrote his Essay on translated verse, in emulation of that finish'd Poem, An Essay upon Poetry, upon w<sup>ch</sup> My Lord bestows justly the name of correct

Happy that Author, whose correct Essay,

But the next line has a little Draw-back,

Repairs so well our old Horatian way.<sup>9</sup>

He was desir'd to alter that Line, but would not: & yet the greatest of the Greeks & Romans thought it not beneath them, to take the charge of repairing the ways, & the public Fabrics. The Earle of D . . . t, one of the most accomplish'd persons of the Age, came sometimes among them, as did the Lord Candish, the Ingenious coll: Finch, Sr Charles Sc . . . gh, Mr Dryden, whom Lord Roſ: look'd upon, as a naturall rather than a correct Poet, & therefore calls him somewhere, *The luxurious Father of the fold*.<sup>10</sup>

There were some few others of less note & Abilities: They aim'd at refining our Language, without abating the force of it, & therefore instead of making a laborious Dictionary, they purpos'd severally to peruse our best writers, & mark such words, as they thought vulgar, base, improper, or obsolete. A great many Innocent, & not useless Projects were form'd, w<sup>ch</sup> I will not mention, because they were not executed.

But Such a Design, My Lord,<sup>11</sup> may now not unseasonably be reviv'd, now that at length we have attain'd that blessed thing, called, An Establishment, w<sup>ch</sup> before seem'd a Sound, without a meaning. 'Tis time to begin the Golden Age again, we have had enough of the Iron and leaden ones. Cardinal R. when he founded the French Academy, seems to have don it, not so much out of love to polite Learning, tho' himselfe was a very good writer, as appears by his Testament Politique, w<sup>ch</sup> you read with a great deal of pleasure, as upon a deeper account. He did it, to amuse busy & turbulent wits & divert them from speculating into matters

<sup>9</sup> *Essay on Translated Verse*, 1-2.

<sup>10</sup> I am not aware that this designation of Dryden occurs in any of Roscommon's extant works.

<sup>11</sup> Chetwood's memoir is addressed "To the Right Honorable My Lord Carteret." John, Lord Carteret (1690-1763), was in 1724, after Chetwood's death, appointed lord lieutenant of Ireland.

of State. . . . But there open'd now so frightfull a scene of public affairs, that it made all these Purposes abortive.<sup>12</sup>

The information that Roscommon was inspired by his membership in the academy to write his *Essay on Translated Verse* in imitation of Mulgrave's *Essay on Poetry* is good evidence for dating the academy some time in the early eighties. The *Essay on Translated Verse* was published by Tonson in the first edition in 1684; Mulgrave's *Essay* was published in 1682. Certainly the time during the last years of Charles II's reign when things were, as Chetwood puts it, "in perfect Tranquillity" was after 1682 when the king's hold on the affections of his subjects grew strong again and remained so until his death. Lacking more precise evidence one may tentatively put the commencement of the earl's academy in about 1682.

The late Professor Emerson, who was apparently unacquainted with Chetwood's memoirs of Roscommon, proposed dating the academy some time between 1680 and 1685 and suggested that Dryden had been not only Roscommon's "principal assistant"—to quote Fenton—but actually the instigator of the idea, which Roscommon merely helped him to realize.<sup>13</sup> Chetwood's account, however, which Fenton's in general so closely resembles that one is led to the belief that Fenton knew it, makes no mention of Dryden as a principal assistant. It is my surmise that the close coöperation of Roscommon and Dryden existed solely in the mind of Fenton, who, seeing the name of the greatest poet of the preceding age in Chetwood's list of members, assumed that such a man would necessarily have been a "principal assistant." Yet Chetwood mentions him last of all, and the modest "Mr" that precedes his name looks oddly out of place in company with the impressive array of titles. One may even surmise that the only reason Dryden's name is there at all was that these noble lords were aware of the illogicality of omitting from such a society as they designed theirs to be, the chief living English man of letters. It does not seem credible that Roscommon, to whose high-mindedness we have more than

<sup>12</sup> Baker Ms. xxxvi, pp. 39-40. (I have omitted three sentences about Richelieu which are not germane to our subject.)

<sup>13</sup> O. F. Emerson, "John Dryden and a British Academy," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 1921-1922, x, 45-58.

one contemporary testimony, would have withheld from Dryden any credit that was due him. In spite of Dryden's expressed interest in academies, as attested by the dedication to *Troilus and Cressida* and the oft-quoted sentence from the dedication to *The Rival Ladies*, it is hardly possible that he either helped found this one or shaped the destinies of it.<sup>14</sup>

One might with reason hope to find at least corroboratory mention of Roscommon's academy in the biographies of the Marquis of Halifax,<sup>15</sup> Lord Maitland (afterward the fourth Earl of Lauderdale), the Earl of Dorset, Lord Cavendish (later the Duke of Devonshire) with whom Roscommon had traveled on the continent before the Restoration,<sup>16</sup> or of Sir Charles Scarborough. Unfortunately all of their biographers are silent on the matter. The biography of Colonel Finch has never been written; indeed, he has not even been identified. Probably, however, he was none other than the husband of the famous Anne of Winchilsea, the Heneage Finch who in 1712 succeeded his nephew Charles as fifth Earl of Winchilsea.<sup>17</sup> Now, however, in the early eighties he held only the rank of colonel in the army, although he was also gentleman of the bedchamber to the Duke of York, to whose household Ros-

<sup>14</sup> Mr. Edmund Freeman in "A Proposal for an English Academy in 1660," *MLR*, xix (1924), 291-300, has also questioned Professor Emerson's conclusions and has presented evidence "to make it seem highly probable that the idea of a literary academy was of somewhat general interest in Dryden's time."

<sup>15</sup> Roscommon's blood relationship to Halifax seems to have escaped notice. They were first cousins once removed, Roscommon's mother being a sister of Halifax's grandmother. Anne Wentworth, elder sister to the Earl of Strafford, married Sir George Savile in 1607. Their son, Sir William Savile, was father to the Marquis of Halifax (see H. C. Foxcroft, *The Life and Letters of George Savile, Bart.* [London, 1898], II). In 1636 James Dillon married Elizabeth Wentworth, a younger sister to Strafford; these were the parents of the fourth Earl of Roscommon.

<sup>16</sup> This information also comes from Chetwood's memoirs: "The late Duke of Devon, was his Fellow Traveller, who, as the Lord R: us'd to say, had a more exact knowledge of the Latin & Greek Authors, than any Gentleman he knew, . . ." (Baker Ms. xxxvi, p. 33).

<sup>17</sup> Colonel Finch is not included in *DNB*. Miss Myra Reynolds, however, in the introduction to *The Poems of Anne Countess of Winchilsea* (Chicago, 1903), devotes some space to him (see in particular pp. xxiv-xxvi). It is on her account that I have relied for the facts of Colonel Finch's biography.

common was also attached as master of the horse to the duchess.<sup>18</sup> Like Roscommon he was nominated to the degree D. C. L. of Oxford University when on May 22, 1683, he, the duke, and a number of the duke's followers visited Oxford.<sup>19</sup> His wife, whom he married in 1684, probably also knew Roscommon, since she had been a maid of honor to the Duchess of York. That she admired him is perfectly clear from a long passage about him in one of her poems, *Ardelia's Answer to Ephelia*,<sup>20</sup> where he appears under the name of Piso, a perfectly natural pseudonym for one who had translated Horace's *Ars Poetica*. It seems, then, that there was a sufficiently intimate relationship between this Colonel Finch and Roscommon to make highly probable, if not certain, his identity with the Colonel Finch of Chetwood's memoirs.<sup>21</sup>

CARL NIEMEYER

Grinnell College

---

<sup>18</sup> This is on Chetwood's authority (see Baker Ms. xxxvi, p. 38: "He now purchases the place of Master of the Horse to the Duchess of York.") and that of Narcissus Luttrell (*A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, I, 325).

<sup>19</sup> Roscommon was nominated to the degree but did not appear to be created. See Anthony & Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses . . . to which are added Fasti Oxonienses* (edited by Bliss, London, 1820), IV, *Fasti* 389. Finch received the degree. See Wood, *Life and Times* (Oxford, 1894), III, 46.

<sup>20</sup> *The Poems of Anne Countess of Winchelsea*, pp. 42-43.

<sup>21</sup> Possibly he was also the Finch mentioned in Otway's epistle to Richard Duke, first published in 1684. The lines describing this Finch are rather vague:

F - - oh, full of kindness, gen'rous as his blood,  
Watchfull to doe to modest merit good (ll. 73-74),

and Mr. J. C. Ghosh is probably right in thinking him unidentifiable (*The Works of Thomas Otway*, Oxford, 1932, I, 35-36); but the lines, especially the phrase "gen'rous as his blood," certainly fit Colonel Heneage Finch.

MR. HUGHS' EDITION OF *HAMLET*

In 1726 Lewis Theobald published his "Shakespeare Restored." It was his just exposition of the shortcomings of Alexander Pope's edition of Shakespeare, which had appeared three years before. Pope made a parade of the editorial thoroughness of his work, laid down good principles for the formation of a sound text of Shakespeare, gave a list of the old editions to be collated, and then devolved most of the hard work of applying these principles—Pope called it the "dull duty of an editor"—upon two of his friends who bungled or slighted it. He thus missed a great opportunity. Of Pope's failure Theobald, a more industrious and learned though less famous man, took full advantage. Choosing the play of *Hamlet* as a fair sample of Pope's skimmed work, Theobald gave to the world the first showing of what sound criticism could do in the direction of restoring the text of Shakespeare to the words which Shakespeare wrote. In the course of this work, Theobald makes numerous complimentary references to the "Impression of *Hamlet* set out by Mr. Hughes," or "the edition revised by the late accurate Mr. John Hughes," and often endorses Hughes' readings.

John Hughes (or Hughes), was a worthy but minor poet and dramatist whose life was shortened by lung trouble of which he died in 1720 when only forty-three years of age. His most successful writing was a play called *The Siege of Damascus*. His work as a Shakespearean editor seems to have been soon forgotten, and during the nineteenth century serious question arose as to the identity and even the existence of this edition of *Hamlet*, the accuracy of which Theobald had commended.

In Vol. VIII of the Cambridge edition, published in 1866 by Clark and Wright, the editors say (page xi)

We have been unable to procure a copy of the Quarto edition of this play edited in 1703 by "the accurate Mr. John Hughes" (Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored*, page 26), and have therefore quoted the readings of it on Theobald's authority. It is different from the Players' Quarto of 1703, and is not mentioned in Bohn's edition of Lowndes's *Bibliographer's Manual*. No copy of it exists in the British Museum, the Bodleian, the Library of the Duke of Devonshire, the Capell Collection, or any other to which we have had access.

Dr. Furness in his *New Variorum Edition* (*Hamlet*, II, 35)



shows further interest in this matter. He quotes what the Cambridge editors say and adds

The test word for this edition (which I have never seen) would be *faction* instead of "fashion," II-II-329, or else *Roaming* instead of "Wrong" of the quartos in I-III-109. I mention this in the hope that it may some day lead to the discovery of a copy which at present certainly appears to be rarer than Q<sup>1</sup>.

The trouble was that the Cambridge editors were on the wrong track in looking for a Quarto edition dated 1703. This error arose from a misreading of what Theobald says on page 51 (numbered 50) of his *Shakespeare Restored*. His phrase is, "both the Quarto edition of 1703, and Mr. Hughs's, have substituted etc." It was a hasty reading which took this to mean that Mr. Hughs' edition is a Quarto dated 1703.

In the meantime Mr. Halliwell-Phillips, in his Catalogue of the Shakespeare Museum at Stratford (published in 1868), had made the following entry:

910—Hamlet, Prince of Denmark; a Tragedy as it is now Acted by His Majesty's Servants. Written by William Shakespear. 12mo. London, 1723. This extremely rare book is believed to contain a copy of the text as edited in 1703 by John Hughs, an edition first pointed out in recent times in the Works of Shakespeare edited by W. G. Clark and W. Aldis Wright, Vol. VIII, Pref. p. 11.

Except that 1718 should be inserted in the place of 1703 as the date of origin, Halliwell-Phillips' conjecture states the facts truly; but some fatality has attended the identification of this volume, for when the Cambridge editors issued their second edition in 1892 they repeated (VII, xiii) the same erroneous statement which has been quoted above from their first edition, accompanying it with the following footnote, in which error is accumulated upon error.

It has been supposed that a very scarce anonymous edition, printed in 1718 in 12mo. by J. Darby for M. Wellington, formerly in the possession of Mr. J. W. Jarvis and now in the Shakespeare Memorial Library at Birmingham, was the long-sought-for edition by Hughs, inasmuch as it has 'Roaming' in I. 3. 109, and 'faction' in II. 2. 337; but a careful comparison of it with the readings of Hughs as given by Theobald has shewn that in three other passages the readings of the 1718 edition differ from those attributed to Hughs. These are, I. 2. 132, 'Canon' (Hughs), 'Cannon' (1718); IV. 7. 100, 'fencers' (Hughs), 'scrimers' (1718); V. 2. 208, 'boding' (Hughs), 'gain-giving' (1718). If therefore Theobald is to be trusted, it would appear that the edition of Hughs is not yet identified.

The fact is that the edition of *Hamlet* in 12mo printed by J. Darby for M. Wellington in 1718 is "Mr. Hughs' Edition." It was reprinted by J. Darby in 1723, evidently from a copy in which Mr. Hughs had entered two or three additional corrections. This is the edition which Halliwell-Phillips presented to the Stratford Museum, and this is the edition which Theobald had in his hands. In his *Shakespear Restored*, Theobald quotes fifteen readings from "Mr. Hughs' impression." Every one of these readings corresponds with the Darby edition of 1723. The Darby edition of 1718 had spelled *canon* with two *n*'s. The discarding of one *n* was one of the changes appearing in the second edition, but as far as the other two instances which the footnote to the Cambridge edition cites, the fact is that *fencers* does appear in iv, vii, 100, and *boding* does appear in v, ii, 208, in both the 1718 and 1723 editions of Hughs' *Hamlet* as printed by J. Darby. This statement is made after comparison with several copies. Of course it is possible that the Cambridge editors had before them a printing containing different readings, but this does not seem likely.

Hughs' edition of 1718 is a small stitched duodecimo intended for stage use, or to be hawked at the theatre door, as had long been the case with the Players' Quartos. It is the first separate play of Shakespeare thus to appear in duodecimo instead of quarto. It may most readily be recognized by the fact that there is prefixed to this text of the play the cast in which Wilks appears as Hamlet, but the other tests given by Dr. Furness or the Cambridge editors will also serve to identify it.

In many ways Hughs' edition presents an interesting text. Its excellencies arise from the fact that its ultimate derivation is from Q<sup>2</sup> rather than from F<sup>4</sup> which is the starting point of the literary texts of this time. After the Restoration, the play of *Hamlet* was printed at least seven times in quarto, always in what is known as Betterton's version because it was his acting text. Betterton (or as we now believe, Sir Wm. Davenant for him) had taken the last pre-war quarto (1637), had made numerous verbal changes which he considered "improvements" (for an analysis see Spencer's *Shakespeare Improved*), had marked in single quotes all passages to be omitted in acting, and had printed this text for the players. Insofar as it followed the old Quartos, it was a good text, but in accordance with Restoration ideas Shakespeare's language was

"reformed" where the editor thought it harsh or uncouth. For instance, he thought the people of his day would better understand Horatio in the first scene of the first act if he said, speaking of the ghost, "It startles me with fear and wonder," instead of, "It harrows me with fear and wonder." Hamlet's "inky" cloak, becomes a "mourning" cloak. These are merely samples of the unwarranted freedom with which the language of Shakespeare was changed in an effort to make it conform to the polite language of the time.

Betterton died in 1710, whereupon the part of Hamlet at Drury Lane Theatre descended to that competent actor Robert Wilks, who evidently determined that these deviations from Shakespeare's text should be as far as possible removed. He also thought that he could improve the play by making different cuts from those which Betterton had used. He accordingly sought the help of his friend Mr. John Hughs, who had some experience in these matters, for he had corrected the sheets and prepared the index for Rowe's edition of Shakespeare published by Tonson in 1714. The result was the edition of the play printed in 1718 which we may call Hughs' Hamlet or Wilks' Hamlet, as may seem most proper. The presumption is that Wilks dictated the cuts and that Hughs restored the text, for although some blots still remain, yet in many cases Mr. Hughs, with a copy of Rowe's edition before him, has restored the old readings where Betterton had unnecessarily departed therefrom. From Rowe he inserts several of those parts of the Folio text which do not occur in the Quartos. It cannot claim to be a good text judged by present-day standards, but in Theobald's day, as compared with what was then available, it was no doubt an excellent text.

The history of this text and its printings is a long one. It was constantly reprinted in duodecimo for theatrical uses, each successive reprint being made from the preceding printing with the usual accumulation of printer's errors which this process entails. The following is a complete list of the printings of Mr. Hughs' edition so far as I have seen them. In order to illustrate this matter of accumulating error, there is put opposite the date of each edition the reading of the last words of the play.

		Pages		Ending
London	Darby	1718	107	Go bid the the Soldiers shoot.
London	Darby	1723	107	Bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Darby			
	(2nd Printing)	1723	107	Bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Booksellers	1734	107	Bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Tonson	1734	107	Go, bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Booksellers	1736	112	(Last page missing in B. P. L. copy)
London	Feales	1736	107	Bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Feales	1737	100	To bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Booksellers	1739	107	Go bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Knapton	1743	96	To bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Knapton	1747	96	To bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Knapton	1750	96	To bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Knapton	1751	96	To bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Knapton	1754	96	Go bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Knapton	1756	96	Go bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Whitworth	1757	96	Go, bid the Soldiers shoot.
(n. p.)	In the Year	1758	96	Go, bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Hitch & Hawes	1759	96	Go, bid the Soldiers shoot.
London	Hitch & Hawes	1761	96	Go, bid the Soldiers shoot.

Of course the last line should read as in the 1718 printing. In the next printing the word "Go" dropped out accidentally and stayed out for a time. In 1737 some one wrongly supplied "To" in place of "Go." In 1754, when a number of other corrections were made, the original word was restored.

These printings are none of them excessively rare except the "Booksellers, 1736" edition, of which but a single, imperfect copy seems to have survived. It is in the Barton collection in the Boston Public Library and lacks the last leaf. None of the printings are common except the two editions of 1734, of which large numbers were printed. They were used in the making up of Tonson's 1735 edition of the Plays of Shakespeare, and are readily procurable.

Robert Wilks died in 1734, and did not often act Hamlet in the later years of his life, the part being taken by Booth or Powell. We do not know what changes, if any, they may have made in the stage version. In 1742 the part came to David Garrick, and we know that he was apt to prepare his own version of the plays in which he acted. Probably his revision of Hamlet for his own use was a gradual process. At all events, when his version of Hamlet was first printed in 1763, it showed a different text. In it the cuts

instead of being marked for excision are totally omitted, or some of them restored, and there are a number of minor changes and some additional omissions. But Garrick's text is not here under examination. There should no longer be any question as to Mr. Hughes' Hamlet.

HENRY N. PAUL

*Philadelphia*

### AN ALLUSION TO BROMLEY IN THE *SHEPHERDS' CALENDAR*

Spenser's association with Bishop Young as the latter's secretary during 1578-79, a fact not definitely known until the present century, has received an increasing amount of attention from modern scholars and has resulted in a new view as to the background of the *Shepherds' Calendar*. With Spenser's residence in the diocese of Rochester established, we are now noticing that either the text or the gloss of at least six of the eclogues contains definite references to Kent or to Bishop Young. Indeed it seems probable that the work was conceived and executed under the bishop's roof and meant particularly to appeal to him and his circle, just as Swift's *Battle of the Books* was done for the eye of Sir William Temple. Going further than that, Mr. Brents Sterling (*PQ.*, x, 321 ff.) suggests the identification of the oak in the February eclogue with Bishop Thomas Watson, who, as a Catholic, was in the custody of Spenser's patron in 1579.

In line with these conclusions I wish to offer another bit of evidence which even more closely associates the poet with his employer: In the July eclogue Morrell, the high church shepherd, and Thomalin, supporting puritan views, are wrangling over the question of whether hills are holy places. Morrell stoutly maintains that they are "sacred unto saints" and gives two examples:

S. Michels mount who does not know,  
that wards the Western coste?  
And of S. Brigets bowre I trow,  
all Kent can rightly boaste. (Lines 41-44)

Renwick, in the notes to his edition of the *Shepherds' Calendar*, points out that in this opening passage Spenser is following Man-

tuan's eighth eclogue and that "S. Michels mount" may have been suggested by Badius' gloss to Mantuan's mention of Mount Garganus, which reads: "divo Michaeli mons insignis." But he continues

I can find no trace of church, chapel, or cell in Kent dedicated to either St. Bridget, that might be called *St. Brigets Bowre*. Taking St. Michael's Mount as a high place on the west, and looking for a similar place in Kent we arrive at Richborough, which Spenser would know and in which, as an antiquary, he would doubtless be interested. He may have that in mind, but the reference is very obscure.

With the last statement anyone who has searched for the source will agree. I believe that Spenser meant it to be obscure to the public but knew that it would call up in the minds of Bishop Young and his friends a very definite local relic of Catholic times.

On the grounds of the episcopal palace at Bromley, the official residence of the Bishop of Rochester in the sixteenth century, had been located one of the more famous shrines of the vicinity of London. This was the well of St. Blaze, reputed to have had healing powers and mentioned in all the county histories of Kent. St. Blaze seems to have been peculiarly associated with Bromley and one of the two local fairs was held on his day, February third. The history of this shrine is well summarized by John Harris in his *History of Kent* (London, 1719, p. 56).

There is a well in the Bishop's Park here, called St. Blaze's Well, which anciently had a chapel by it that was dedicated to St. Blazius; and this, saith Philpot, used to be much frequented at Whitsuntide; because Lucas, who was Legate here from Pope Sixtus the IVth, granted an Indulgence, or remission of forty days penance, to all such as should visit this chapel, and perform their devotions here, in the three holy days at Whitsuntide or Pentecost.

After the Reformation this shrine fell into disuse and the well itself was forgotten and not rediscovered until the eighteenth century.<sup>1</sup> Finally, accounts of the vicinity of Bromley show that the episcopal palace and the well, which was not far from it, were on a hill. Here, then, is exactly the kind of local reference that might be expected. The dismantled shrine and its former fame must have frequently been a topic of conversation in gatherings at

<sup>1</sup> See complete account in E. L. S. Horsburgh's *Bromley, Kent*, London, 1930.

the palace and its condition evidenced as a symbol of the defeat of the Catholic cause. To the bishop's circle it would be an additional touch to the satire of Bishop Aylmer (represented by Morrell) that he is made to bring in to support the holiness of high places an abandoned shrine and a hill that after all was not very high.

If it be granted that this identification is correct, the question remains as to why Spenser changed the name to St. Bridget. In the first place, we may assume that he felt it unfitting to bring openly into public print the real name of a place so closely connected with his patron.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, in the possessive case, which he happened to be using, the two names are metrical equivalents. A last reason, and perhaps the deciding one, was that a curious error in a book Spenser, with his antiquarian interests, was very likely to have read, had already changed the two names. Lambarde's *Perambulation of Kent*, which appeared in 1576, contained a list of the days of the local fairs in each town. Under Bromley we find "1. February, being S. Bridgets Day: and the 25. July, being S. James Day." As a matter of fact, the Charter Roll originally granting the fairs (25 & 26 Henry VI) states clearly that the first was to be on St. Blaze's day. I have had an extensive search made by an experienced research worker in London through the *Registrum Roffense*, *Archeologia Cantiana*, and the calendars of various patent rolls and state papers between 1447 and 1576 without finding any record of a change in the date. It would therefore seem that Lambarde's date is an error, and Spenser would have known it was an error since he was living in Bromley and the manor in which the fair was held belonged to the Bishops of Rochester. Thus if he were thinking of a fictitious name for St. Blaze's Well, St. Bridget would probably have been the first to come into his mind.

LEICESTER BRADNER

*Brown University*

---

<sup>2</sup> It is to be noted that E. K. glosses "S. Michels mount" but not "S. Brigets bowre."

## WYATT'S LETTERS TO HIS SON

Sir Thomas Wyatt making love in sonnets, like Berowne or Romeo, is familiar to all students of English literature; but Sir Thomas Wyatt in the rôle of Polonius is not often thought upon. Yet it is more than a century since the two letters of advice from Wyatt to his son were first printed<sup>1</sup> from the Harington manuscript of his poems, the manuscript now known as British Museum, Egerton MS. 2711. In the opinion of their first editor, the transcript of the letters is in the hand of their recipient, Thomas Wyatt the Younger. Miss Foxwell,<sup>2</sup> reprinting the same letters from the same manuscript, but with their sixteenth-century spelling, makes no conjectures as to their copyist. The first of these letters is headed, "From him [Sir Thomas Wyatt] out of Spayne to his son, then xiv<sup>3</sup> yeres old"; the second, "Agayn vnto his son out of Spayne about the same time." Wyatt served in Spain as Ambassador to Charles V from April 1537 to April 1539; his son seems to have been born in 1521:<sup>4</sup> it has usually been assumed, therefore, that the letters belong to the first part of Wyatt's ambassadorship, although no one has suggested an exact date.

In this article I wish briefly to call attention to another text of these letters, British Museum, Additional MS. 33,271 (hereafter referred to as Add), ff. 25a-26a. It contains both variations from and additions to the printed text, but, since a rotograph of the manuscript is available at the Library of Congress (Modern Language Association Deposit, No. 215), it seems necessary to print here only the most significant differences.

<sup>1</sup> *Works of . . . Surrey and . . . Wyatt* (1815-16), edited by George Frederick Nott, II, 265-275. This text was reprinted in Pickering's Aldine edition, *The Poetical Works of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (1831), pp. xxxiii-xli.

<sup>2</sup> *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wiat* (1913), edited by A. K. Foxwell, II, 259-264.

<sup>3</sup> The MS copyist first wrote *xiiii*, then wrote a *v* over the minims. Miss Foxwell interpreted this as *xiv*, Nott as *xv*. Possibly the latter reading is to be preferred, for it is more consonant with the date I propose below for this letter.

<sup>4</sup> Sir Thomas Wyatt the Younger was "described as 'twenty-one and upwards' in the 'inquisitio post mortem' of his father, which was dated 8 Jan. 1542-3." (*DNB*.)



(1) At the end of the first letter, Add gives a conclusion elsewhere omitted: "At Paris, the xv<sup>th</sup> of Aprill. Your lovinge father, Thomas Wyat." Wyatt is known to have been in Paris, traveling toward Spain, on the 10th and 12th of April, 1537,<sup>5</sup> and does not seem to have been there in any other April, unless possibly on his way home in 1539. This letter may be confidently dated April 15, 1537. The second letter probably followed within a couple of months—from Spain. Add offers no new evidence as to date.

(2) Add gives the following additional material at the end of the second letter: "I remitt you wholie to youre father in lawe. Recomend me to my daughter Iane and my daughter Besse, and write vnto me, at the least to exercise *your* hand. And farewell, with Gods blessinge. . . ." All accounts of Wyatt's life have assumed that Thomas the Younger was his only child. "My daughter Iane" may refer to this son's wife, Jane, daughter of Sir William Hawte of Bishopsbourne, Kent; but "Besse" must be Wyatt's own daughter. Perhaps she may be identified with the "Eliz. Wyott" who was a nun at Barking at the time of its dissolution, November 26, 1539.<sup>6</sup>

(3) There are other evidences of difficulties between the senior Wyatt and his wife,<sup>7</sup> but only Add gives Wyatt's own version of the trouble:

Loue well and agree *with your wief*, for where there is noyse and debate in the howse, there is vnquiett dwellinge, and much the more where it is in one bed. Frame well *your self* to loue and rule well *your wief as your fellowe*, and she shall loue and reuerence you as her head. Such as you are to her, such shall she be to you. Obey and reuerence *your father* in lawe as you would me, and remember that long lief followeth them that reuerence theire parents and elders, and the blessinge of God for good agreement betwene the wief and the husbunde—as fruite of manye children, *which* I for the like thinge doe lacke, and the faulte is both in *your mother* and me, but cheiflie in her.

With this compare Miss Foxwell's text, noting the significant omission at the end of the passage:

<sup>5</sup> James Gairdner (editor), *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, xiv, Part I, 508, Entry 1123—Wyatt's account of his expenses as Ambassador.

<sup>6</sup> Gairdner, *op. cit.*, xv, Entry 1032, p. 547.

<sup>7</sup> See Gairdner, *op. cit.*, xii, Part I, 335, Entry 766; xvi, 228, Entry 467 ("Hoyet"); xvi, 319-302, Entry 662; xvii, Appendix B, p. 717, Entry 6 ("Huyet").

Loue wel and agre with your wife, for where is noyse and debate in the hous ther is vnquiet dwelling; and mitch more wher it is in one bed. Frame wel your self to loue and rule wel and honestly your wife as your fellow and she shal loue and reuerens you as her hed. Such as you are vnto her, such shal she be to you. Obey and reuerens your fathir in law as you wold me, and remember that long life folowth them that reuerens theyr fathirs and eldirs, and the blissing of God for good agrement between the wife and husband is fruyt of many children.

These three are the most important differences between the two texts of these letters. Two more parallel passages will suffice to show the nature of most of the variants. Sometimes one and sometimes the other text seems preferable. In the pairs below, the first quotation is from Add and the second from Miss Foxwell's print of Egerton 2711.

(4) You therefore, yf you be sure and haue God in *your* sleue to call to his grace at last, venture not hardlye by my example vpon naughtie vnthriftines in trust of his goodnes; and, besides the shame, I dare laye twoo to one you shall perishe in the adventure, for trust not that my wishe or desire of God for you shall stande in as much effecte as I thincke my fathers did me. We are all alyke accepted of Him; beginne therefore betimes, make *your* foundacons on God and goodness, etc.

You therfor, if ye be sure and haue God in your sleue, to cal you to His grase at last, ventur hardly by myne example apon naughty vnthriftines in trust of His goodnes, and besides the shame I dare lay ten to one ye shal perisch in the aduentur, for trust not [Nott reads *me*] that my wisch or desire of God for you shal [Nott inserts *not*] stand you in as mitch effect as I think my fathir's did for me. We ar not all accepted of Him.

Beginne therfore betimes, make God and goodnes your fundations, etc.

(5) When there is a custome gotten of auoydinge of yll, then can not a gentle corrage content to be idle and to rest without doinge nothinge. Then had you need gather an heape of good opinions, and to gett them perfectly, as it were, on *your* fingers ends. Reason not greatly vpon the approvinge of them; take them as alreadye approved, because they were of honest mens leauinge. Of them there is no question, and it is no small helpe to ioyne vnto them the good opinion of morall philosophers; amonge whome I would Seneca were *your* studie, because it is little, to be euer in *your* bosome. These thinges shall leade you to knowe goodlye thinges, *which*, when a man knoweth and taketh pleasure in them, he is a beast that followeth not them; no, nor he can not but followe them.

When ther is a custome gottin of auoyding to doo euil, then can [Nott, *cometh*] a gentle corage be [Nott, *Be*] content to be idle and to rest without doing eny thing. Then loo [Nott, *too*] had ye nede to gathir an hepe of good opinions and to get them perfectly as it wer on your fingers ends. Rest not greatly apon the approuing of them; take them as already aprouid, bicaus they wer of honist mens leauings—of them. Of God ther

is no question. And it is no smal help to them the good opinion of moral philosophers among whom I wold Senek wer [Nott, bracketed *in*] your studye and Epictetus, bicaus it is litel, to be euir in your [Nott omits] bosome. Thes things shal lead you to know goodly [Nott inserts bracketed *things*], which when a man knowth and takith plesure in them he is a best that folowth not them; no, nor he can not but folow them.

ALBERT MCHARG HAYES

*Haddonfield, New Jersey*

---

### GREENE'S USE OF ARIOSTO IN *ORLANDO FURIOSO*

In a brief note in *MLN*. (xxxI, 440-1) Charles W. Lemmi, pointing out the relationship between Greene's *Orlando Furioso* and Ariosto's poem, says that "Every situation in Greene's *Orlando Furioso* has its analogue in Ariosto's." He then selects specific instances in the play that parallel the Italian source. In discussing Canto v of the poem he makes the following comparison with Greene.

In the play one of the rejected suitors, the crafty Sacripant, causes Angelica to be banished, then condemned to death by her father, by falsely representing her as unchastely faithless to Orlando, who, however, rescues her, clears her name, and wrings confession and life from her accuser. In the poem (Canto iv) another scheming aspirant to the hand of another princess attempts precisely the same thing . . . whereupon the knight Rinaldo wrings confession and life from him, having first rescued the princess's maid from ruffians in a forest precisely as Orlando, in the play, rescues Angelica.

Lemmi is correct as far as he goes. However, he seems to have missed seeing that the tale narrated in Canto v of Ariosto's work really supplies the frame-work for Greene's *Orlando Furioso*. Instead of building his play upon the relationship between Orlando and Angelica as it is set down in the Italian original, Greene retains these names, as well as the name of Medor, but substitutes the story of Ariodantes and Genevra. The various elements employed to complicate the drama are borrowed from different parts of the Italian poem. The most significant of these devices is the use of the love-verses to inspire Orlando with madness (Canto xxiii).

It becomes readily apparent that Greene's Angelica must have

been modeled after the Genevra of Ariosto, rather than after the woman who bears her name in the poem. Not only is Angelica's character like that of Genevra, but the course of her love-story parallels the other's very closely. What Greene did was to use the love-poems hung on the trees as the ruse of an unfavoured suitor, rather than the deception used in Canto v. In Ariosto, an accomplice of Polinesso, the interloper, conspires to array herself in the princess's clothes and that evening keep an assignation with her lover. Ariodantes, imagining that it is his mistress whom he sees in the arms of another, believes her faithless. He disappears and the rumour spreads that it was Genevra's duplicity that caused his death. No one believes her faithful. Her name is finally cleared when a champion appears at a tourney to fight for her. Ariodantes has come there disguised, intending likewise to serve his mistress. In the interim, the accomplice of the scheming duke has confessed, and the lovers are re-united.

Retaining the outline of this narrative, Greene makes several alterations suggested by other parts of the original. The most important change is the use of the name of *Orlando* and the introduction of the madness theme in place of the reported death. The guilt of the lady is made apparent not by means of an accomplice masquerading in her clothes, but by love-poems carved on trees purporting to reveal an illicit relationship between the lady and Medor, one of the courtiers at her father's palace. Much attention is devoted to the depiction of Orlando's madness, and an enchantress who appears in Ariosto's poem is made the agent of his cure in the play.

By viewing the Genevra story rather than the Angelica plot as the romantic basis of the play, we can provide a more logical parallelism in the sequence of the narrative. It is from this story that we get the heroine at her father's court, that we derive the motivation of Sacripant, the ill-favour in which Angelica is held at court subsequent to Orlando's madness, and the solution which comes with the tourney at which her lover comes *incognito* to contend in her behalf, and it is from this account that we obtain the final reconciliation and marriage of the lovers.

Polinesso, the Duke of Albany, who, in Ariosto invents the plot to incriminate Genevra, is Sacripant's counterpart. Both are primarily concerned with accession to the throne, and both employ a

kindred type of treachery when rebuffed by the ladies, whose love in both cases is already pledged elsewhere. Both succeed in convincing the respective lovers of their mistresses' infidelity. The arrival of the Twelve Peers of France to avenge Orlando in the play is paralleled by the attempt of Lucarno in the poem to avenge his brother, Ariodantes, for the supposed duplicity of Genevra. Polinesso, like Sacripant, confesses his fraud with his dying breath.

In summing up the indebtedness of Robert Greene to Cantos iv, v, and vi of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* we reach the following conclusions: (1) The character of Sacripant is inspired by the character of Polinesso. (2) The character of Angelica and the whole course of her fortune has been anticipated by Genevra. (3) The estrangement of the lovers in Act II, Scene ii is found in Canto v. (4) The expedition of the Peers in Act iv is based on Lucarno's attempt to avenge his brother. (5) In Act v, Sc. i, the confession and death of Sacripant parallels the confession and death of Polinesso. (6) In Act v, Sc. ii, the tournament is based on the Tourney in Canto v. (7) The masking of Orlando is borrowed from the masking of Ariodantes. (8) The reconciliation and betrothal is borrowed from Canto vi, which continues and concludes the Ariodantes-Genevra tale in Ariosto.

MORRIS ROBERT MORRISON

*The University of Texas*

---

#### NEPTUNE'S 'AGAR' IN LYLY'S *GALLATHEA*

In his discussion of the mythological background of the sea monster in Lyly's *Gallathea*, Professor Bond asserts that a convolute bearing the date 1578 and containing the works of Hyginus, Apollodorus, and other writers is the chief source of Lyly's mythological allusions. In this particular instance, he points out that the material in this convolute is closer to Lyly's account of Neptune's revenge than are the scattered references in Ovid to sacrifices to the sea-god.<sup>1</sup> The fallacy in Professor Bond's argument arises from the nature of the beast sent by Neptune. In Lyly's account, the monster not only carries off the virgins that are devoted to him but

<sup>1</sup> R. W. Bond, *The Complete Works of John Lyly* (1902), II, 420-421.

his coming causes the water to boil<sup>2</sup> and produces an inundation.<sup>3</sup> The name 'agar' that Lyly gives to the monster is, as Professor Bond was aware, derived from 'eagre' or the tidal wave on the Humber estuary.

This flood-producing quality of the monster sent by Neptune is not supplied by the convolute that Professor Bond asserts to be the source. In the section of that work that pertains to the monster one reads: 'ob eam rem Neptunus cetum misit, qui Troiam vexaret.' A survey of renaissance mythologies indicates that the well known work by Natales Comes is the only one that contains all of the material pertinent to Lyly's description. Comes' account runs:

Laomedon divinis honoribus prosecutus est Apollinem, at Neptunus ubi diu servivisset, nullamque accepisset mercedem, indignatus horrendum cete immisit, *quod mare evomens universam regionem inundavit*. Illa de causa et filiam Hesionem quam unice amabat, ac multo magis quam vel Aethasam vel Ayochen vel Medicasten, quas ceteras filias habebat, ceto exponere iussus est ab oraculo Laomedon, et multa alia incommode inde sunt consecuta.<sup>4</sup>

DON CAMERON ALLEN

State College of Washington

---

#### BEN JONSON'S APPRECIATION OF CHAUCER AS EVIDENCED IN *THE ENGLISH GRAMMAR*

Ben Jonson's *English Grammar* offers interesting insight into a great scholar's knowledge of Chaucer in the period between 1620 and 1640. The original MS of this work perished in the famous fire of 1625, which destroyed his library, but it was rewritten and first printed in the 1640 folio of Jonson's Works. In the second part of this grammar, which concerns syntax, he supplies twenty-five illustrations from Chaucer. His authority was Speght's text of 1602, for there is a marked tendency to modernization in both words and spelling.<sup>1</sup> It also accounts for his attributing to Chaucer three lines from Lydgate's *A Goodly Balade*, which both Thynne and

<sup>2</sup> *Gallathea*, I, iv, 10. The reference to the boiling waters might easily come from Ovid; cf., *Met.* IV, 670 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, i, 25-35.

<sup>4</sup> *Mythologiae* (1616), pp. 85-86.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Herford's & Simpson's *Ben Jonson*, I, 263.

Speght include among Chaucer's poems.<sup>2</sup> But it does not account for the gross errors which have crept into these illustrations. Many of them are typographical and explain such changes as 'fate' for 'foot'<sup>3</sup> and 'false' for 'softe.'<sup>4</sup> The repetition of 'blacker' for 'fouler'<sup>5</sup> may be a compositor's error. These explanations will not suffice, however, in the case of 'praise' for 'craft,'<sup>6</sup> and 'such things as fraile man purposeth' for 'Soch thing as mans frele wit purposeth.'<sup>7</sup> Unnecessary and clumsy repetitions of words occur as

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Skeat's *Chaucer*, I, 36-37.

<sup>3</sup> Speght, 1602. *The Legende of good Women*, "Of Tisbe of Babilone," Fol. 188, v. 2.

She rist her up, with a full drery hart,  
And in a caue, with dreadfull foot she start.

Cf. Fol. 1641. *The English Grammar*, chap. V, p. 78.

She rist her up with a full dreary heart  
And in a cave with dreadfull fate she start.

<sup>4</sup> Speght, 1602. *The Doctor of Physickes Tale*, Fol. 59, r. 1.

Under a sheepheard soft and negligent,  
The Wolfe hath many a sheep & lambe to rent.

Cf. Fol. 1641. *The English Grammar*, chap. III, p. 74.

Under a Shepheard false, and negligent,  
The Wolfe hath many a Sheepe, and Lambe to rent.

<sup>5</sup> Speght, 1602. *The Third Booke of Fame*, Fol. 269, r. 2.

What did this Eolus, but he  
Tooke out his blacke trompe of bras,  
That fouler than the Deuill was.

Cf. Fol. 1641. *The English Grammar*, chap. IIII, p. 76.

What did this Aeolus, but he  
Tooke out his blacke trumpe of brasse,  
That blacker than the Divell was.

<sup>6</sup> Speght, 1602. *The Third Booke of Troilus*, Fol. 165, r. 2.

Thou are at ease, and hold thee well therein,

. . . . .

As great a crafte is to kepe well as win.

Cf. Fol. 1641. *The English Grammar*, chap. VII, p. 80.

Thou art at ease, and hold thee well therein.  
As great a praise is to keepe well, as win.

<sup>7</sup> Speght, 1602. *A goodly Balade of Chaucer*, Fol. 197.

but great God disposeth

And maketh casuall by his prouidence,  
Soch thing, as mans frele wit purposeth.

Cf. Fol. 1641. *The English Grammar*, chap. VII, p. 80.

But great God disposeth  
And maketh casuall by his Providence  
Such things as fraile man purposeth.

well as the introduction of new ones. Through such slight changes in a verse as the addition or omission of a word or the alteration of a spelling, much that is Chaucerian both in language and in metre, disappears from the line. This brief analysis may suffice to show how partial must have been the appreciation, even in high places, of Chaucer's poetry.<sup>8</sup>

ERMA R. GEBHARDT

*Erie, Pennsylvania*

---

### THE LOST PLAY OF ÆSOP'S CROW

During the Christmas season of 1551-2 things were tense about the court of Edward VI. The King's uncle, Protector Somerset, had fallen a victim to the machinations of the subtle Duke of Northumberland. Somerset was in the Tower awaiting execution. Northumberland had assumed the rôle of Protector. The commons were restless, and the boy king seems to have shared the general feeling of displeasure with the course of events. To divert the young king, Northumberland arranged to keep the Christmas season after the old fashion. A Master of the King's Pastimes was appointed in the person of one George Ferrers, "Which Gentleman," according to Grafton's *Chronicle*, "so well supplied his office, both in shew of sundry sightes and deuises of rare inuention, and in act of diuers enterludes and matters of pastime, played by persons," that the commons, the critical nobles, and the King himself were all well satisfied.<sup>1</sup> The arrangements, however, had to be rather hurried, most of the costumes seem to have been borrowed from the Office of the Revels, and details as to the interludes offered are not preserved.

So well did George Ferrers please the King and the court, however, that he was again in charge of the Christmas festivities the following year, the last of the young king's life.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The writer is preparing an edition of the plays of William Cartwright. The above is a portion of the introduction.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, II (1568), 1317. It is interesting to remember that, according to Stowe, George Ferrers was responsible for the section of Grafton's work that dealt with the reign of Queen Mary.

<sup>2</sup> For an account of the pastimes of these seasons, see A. Feuillerat, *Documents Relating to the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward*



It is not certain to which of these Christmas seasons William Baldwin refers in his "Argument" to the curious work *Beware the Cat*, though Professor Feuillerat is probably right in thinking it the 1552-3 season.<sup>3</sup> Baldwin's account of the gentlemen responsible for the King's pastimes is in itself interesting:

It chaunced that at Christmas last, I was at the Court with Maister Ferrers then maister of the Kings maiesties pastimes, about setting forth of certain Interludes, which for ye Kinges recreation we had deuised & were in learning. In which time among many other exercises among our selues: we vsed nightly at our lodging to talke of sundry things for the furtherance of suche offices, wherin eche man as then serued, for which purpose it pleased Maister Ferrers to make me his bedfellowe, and vpon a Pallet cast vpon the rushes in his owne Chamber to lodge Maister Willot and Maister Stremer, the one his Astronomer: the other his Diuine. And among many other things to long to rehearse: it hapned on a night (which I think was the twenty eight of December) after that M. Ferrers was come from the Court, and in bed: there fel a controuersie between maister Streamer (who with Maister Willot had already slept their first sleep) and mee that was newly come vnto bed, the effect wherof was whether Birds and beasts had reason, the occasion therof was this. I had heard that the Kings Players were learning a play of Esops Crowe, wherin the moste part of the actors were birds, the deuice wherof I discommended, saying it was not Comicall to make either speechlesse things to speeke: or brutish things to commen reasonably. And although in a tale it be sufferable to imagin and tel of some thing by them spoken or reasonably doon (which kinde Esope lawdably vsed) yet it was vncomely (said I) and without example of any authour to bring them in liuely parsonages to speake, doo, reason, and allege authorities out of authours.<sup>4</sup>

This play of *Æsops Crow* has been lost, but Professor Wallace's explanation, or rather exclamation, as to its characteristics has apparently gone unchallenged:

Then the work of George Ferrers in the last two yeares of Edward VI, overshadowing the customary interludes with processional triumphs. . . . It was all extravagant boyishness to entertain a boy-king. . . . This sort of foolery, although it affected the drama to the extent of producing at

---

*VI and Queen Mary* (1914), especially pp. 56-63, 89-114, and 134-143, with the notes thereon. See also E. K. Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage* (1903), I, 405-407.

<sup>3</sup> See C. W. Wallace, *The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare* (1912), p. 73, and the comment of Professor Feuillerat, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

<sup>4</sup> I quote from a photostat of the British Museum copy of the 1584 edition of *Beware the Cat*.

least one Maeterlinckian [*sic*] *Chantecler* in the guise of *Aesop's Crowe* with the actors dressed as birds, had not killed but only obscured the Court drama. . . .<sup>5</sup>

For a long time I was curious about this explanation of Professor Wallace's, for the boy king, Edward VI, author of a moral play *The Whore of Babylon*,<sup>6</sup> promulgator of the revised prayer-book in English, sitting from his childhood under the theological teachings of the most ardent of the Reformation preachers, was not much given to what Professor Wallace calls extravagant boyishness. Nor did the description of the play which brought birds in as lively personages which "speake, doo, reason, and allege authorities out of authours" seem to me exactly Maeterlinckian. It will be remembered that the year 1552 brought the publication of the second revised prayer-book. It also brought the great controversy concerning the mass. The Princess Mary was openly defiant concerning her continued hearing of the mass, and the Council was powerless to stop her. Everywhere there was controversy concerning the services of the church, the new prayer-book, the abolishing of the mass, and similar burning issues.<sup>7</sup>

At last I found in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* an enlightening passage. It is a passage at the conclusion of his long exposition concerning the canon of the mass:

And thus haue ye in some the gatherynges of the masse, with the canon and all the appurtenances of the same, which, not much vnlike to the crow of Esope being patched with the feathers of so many birdes, was so longe a getheryng, that the temple of Salomon was not so long in building, as the popes masse was in making. wherby iudge now thy self (good reader) whether this masse did procede from Iames & other Apostles or no. And yet this was one of the principal causes for which so much turmoil was made in the church, with the bloudshed of so many godly men. . . .<sup>8</sup>

A play called *Aesop's Crow* that dealt with the mass, controversially citing authorities out of authors, this was a play in the mood of the court of Edward VI in the year 1552.

<sup>5</sup> Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

<sup>6</sup> See Bishop Bale's *Scriptorum Illustrium maioris Brytannie . . .*, Basle, 1557-9, p. 674.

<sup>7</sup> For a full account of this dispute with the Princess Mary, see Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, II, part I, pp. 447-458.

<sup>8</sup> Foxe, *op. cit.* (1563), p. 900.

As a matter of fact *Æsop's Crow* seems to be a telescoping of *Æsop's jay* and *Horace's crow*, as witness the tale told in *Æsop's Fable / in tru Ortō'graphy with Grammarnótz*. . . . By William Bullokar, published in 1585:<sup>9</sup>

Of the iay.

The iay decked him-self with a pecoks fethers. Afterward seming to him-self to be prety-faier, he geteth him to the kynd of the pecoks, his own kynd being forsakn. At-the-length, the deceit being vnderstood they make the foolish bird naked of his colors, and bæť him. Horace in the first book of his epistles, teleth this fable of a sely crow, He sayeth, that the crow being dekt with fethers being gathered-together, which had fal'n from birds, was a moking-stok, after that eueryon of the birds had pluckt-of his fethar, Lest perhaps her-after, the stok of birds may com to crau-agein their fethers, and mooue laughing to som, being mad bar of his stoln colors.

LILY B. CAMPBELL

*University of California at Los Angeles*

## AN UN-NOTICED ACROSTIC AND AN INGLORIOUS POET

Henry Bradshaw's *Life of St. Werburge*<sup>1</sup> begins with a "Prologue" written by J. T. in honor of the author. The initial letters of the lines of the first two stanzas of this prologue spell the name of Henri Bradsha.

This acrostic is pointed out by Horstmann, so that it would seem surprising that he missed another at the end of the *Life of St. Werburge*. The explanation lies in the fact that Pynson in his edition of 1521 spaced off the acrostic of the Prologue and printed it in special capitals, but did not so treat the acrostic at the end. The latter follows:

*"An other balade to saynt werburge.*

W ith hert contrite accepte my supplicacion,  
A ydyng my fraylete and lyfe vacillaunt,  
R enegate and contumace in all obstinacion,  
B ewrapt with all synne / detestable and recreaunt;  
V ouchsafe to supplie Iesu and geat graunt

<sup>9</sup> Folios D3 and D4. In the interest of clarity I have omitted the symbols of the "tru ortography" in the text of the story.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Carl Horstmann, EETS., ES., LXXXVIII, p. 1.

R emysson to haue of my synnes generall,  
 G reuous and thrall / that I may the auaunt:  
 A, gentill Werburge / to thy doctrine me call.  
 W herfore thy father / thy mother Ermenilde  
 E nclined both to dedes catholique,  
 R uffine and Kenrede / thy bretherne were fulfild  
 B oth with great grace / through martyrdome both like,  
 W ith diuers of thy kynne magnifique  
 R edact in the catholique papall:  
 G eat me suche grace to voyde all synnes inique  
 A nd gentill Werburge, to thy doctrine me call.  
 W ith thy faithfull clennes / thy soule was sure preserued,  
 E uer contynuyng in doctrine celicall,  
 R efusyng vanite / from vertue neuer swarued  
 B ut in all grace remaynyng principall;  
 V nto thy deth exhortyng great and small  
 R uled to be / to the preceptes diuine—  
 G ouerned by grace / were thy disciples all:  
 A, gentill Werburge, call me to suche doctrine.  
 W orldly felicitye abiect from my courage;  
 E nuy and pride / with lustes voluptuous,  
 R ancorous cupidite myn hert sore do aswage,  
 B ryng oyntmentes sanative for my sores dolorous;  
 V nclose thy succours / and be beniuolous,  
 R edy to be preseruyng me from pyne:  
 G ouerne my lyfe from all actes daungerous,  
 A nd gentill Werburge, call me to thy doctrine.  
 B e nowe beniuolent / whan I shall on the call,  
 V nto thy slaue / as my trust hath ben sure;  
 L eue vnto me for a memoriall  
 K nowlege effectuall of thy lyfe pure,  
 L yuyng ther-after / and so tendure,  
 E uer in purite my lyfe to contynue,  
 Y eldyng thanks for thy most holsome lure—  
 Christ ouer vs holde his hande / al vices teschue. Amen."

Three ballades adorn the end of Bradshaw's *Lyfe of St. Werburge*. As the first of these is called "*A balade to the auctour*," and as the second also commends his work, it is hardly to be supposed that Henry Bradshaw was himself the author of any of the three. The most reasonable interpretation seems to be that a man named Bulkley enjoyed Bradshaw's work and contributed the third ballade in which he enshrined his own name.

Who was Bulkley? Save for this one poem, he seems to have

been altogether a mute, inglorious Milton. He is not listed by Anthony à Wood or in any other such compilation that I have seen. Like Bradshaw, he seems to have belonged to the school of Lydgate and of ornate "polished" terms. The refrain of his ballade suggests that he may have been a novice or probationer at the Abbey of St. Werburgh's itself, or even a cleric in orders.

The name Bulkley, with various spellings, was not uncommon in Chester in the Sixteenth century. Morris<sup>2</sup> shows that George Bulkeley was mayor of the city in 1494-5; a Sir Richard Bulkley was prominent in 1583; and another Richard Bulkley figures as sheriff<sup>3</sup> more than a century earlier. It would be tempting to associate the poet of our ballade with the William Bulkley who owned Royal MS. 2 A xxi in the Sixteenth century.<sup>4</sup> The manuscript was a manual of Sarum use in Latin.

To extend the search further is to be embarrassed with a multitude of persons whose names alone survive. Thus Ormerod in his *History of Cheshire* supplies the pedigrees of the Bulkeley's of Eaton, of Bulkeley, of Alstanton, of Cheadle Bulkeley, of Haughton, but brings us no nearer to the identity of this wistful follower of St. Werburgh whose self-built monument, such as it is, has proved less perishable than stone.

F. M. SALTER

*The Henry E. Huntington Library*  
*San Marino, California*

## CHAUCER: SATURN'S DAUGHTER

In the *Knight's Tale*, A 1. 2453, Chaucer has Saturn address Venus as "My deere doghter Venus." Professor F. N. Robinson, in his recent edition of Chaucer, supplies the following note on the passage: "In making Venus daughter of Saturn Chaucer was very likely following RR, 5541, 10827 ff. In l. 2222 above she is called *Doughter to Jove*." Dr. W. C. Curry has also taken the line to mean that Saturn is regarded as the father of Venus. "Saturn, as Chaucer

<sup>2</sup> Rupert H. Morris, *Chester in Plantagenet and Tudor-Reigns*, privately printed, Chester: n. d., p. 581.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 428, 433, 580.

<sup>4</sup> Catalogue of the Royal Manuscripts.

presents him, is entirely the planet except that his being represented as the father of Venus suggests a myth connected with his godship." (*Chaucer and the Medieval Sciences*, p. 127.)

It seems probable, however, that Chaucer is not here following the myth which makes Saturn the father of Venus. As Robinson has pointed out, earlier in the *Knight's Tale* Chaucer has stated specifically that she is "Doughter to Jove." Now, whereas one would not be surprised to find that Chaucer has changed her parentage in the course of two or three hundred lines, it would be very odd to find that Chaucer had changed back again only a few lines after the passage in question, for in l. 2477 Saturn says to Venus "I am thyn aiel [grandfather]." And if we are to take *daughter* in the sense in which Robinson takes it, we must suppose that in l. 2668 Chaucer proceeded to change the parentage a fourth time:

Saturnus seyde, "Doghter, hoold thy pees!"

Surely it seems more likely that Chaucer is in this story consistently following the myth which makes Venus the daughter of Jupiter and the grand-daughter of Saturn; and that he is using "daughter" in the sense of "female member of a family" or perhaps "as a term of affectionate address to a woman or girl by an older person or one in a superior relation." (See *NED*, *daughter*, B. 2 and B. 3.) Chaucer uses the word in this sense elsewhere:

So sore abasht was she, tyl that Nature  
Seyde, "Doughter, drede yow nought, I yow assure."

PF ll. 447-448.

And therwithal Dyane gan apeere,  
With bowe in honde, right as an hunteressee,  
And seyde, "Doghter, stynt thyn hevynesse."

A ll. 2346-2348.

This interpretation of "daughter" is perhaps strengthened when we remember that Chaucer could not have said "grand-child" or "grand-daughter" had he wished to. The first instance of "grand-child" which the *NED*. gives is dated 1587 and the first example of "grand-daughter," 1611. The only terms of relationship which combine the term "grand" which were in use in Chaucer's day were "grandsire" and "granddame."

Elsewhere in Chaucer's works (with the exception of the translation of the *Romaunt of the Rose*) Venus is regarded as the

daughter of Jove. See *Troilus and Criseyde*, III, 1. 3, where she is called "Joves doughter deere" and III, 1. 1807, where "the doughter to Dyone" is an allusion to the myth which regarded her as the child of Jupiter and Dione.

CLEANTH BROOKS

*Louisiana State University*

### THE JOB PASSAGE IN THE *CLERKES TALE*

At the end of Part V of the *Clerkes Tale* occurs a stanza in which Chaucer, praising the humility of Griselda and of woman-kind in general, compares her to Job, the proverbial exemplar of patience:

Men speke of Job, and moost for his humblesse,  
As clerkes, whan hem list, konne wel endite,  
Namely of men, but as in soothfastnesse,  
Though clerkes preise wommen but a lite,  
Ther kan no man in humblesse hym acquite  
As womman kan, ne kan been half so trewe  
As wommen been, but it be falle of newe.<sup>1</sup>

Now, no mention of Job appears at this point in Chaucer's Latin original, Petrarch's prose tale of Griselda, as it is printed in the Chaucer Society's *Originals and Analogues*; nor in Boccaccio's Italian, from which the Latin is drawn; nor in the French version which Chaucer employed as his secondary source.<sup>2</sup> Consequently the stanza has always been considered a Chaucerian addition, wholly original with the English poet.<sup>3</sup>

But MS. 458 at the Library of Corpus Christi College of Cambridge University—one of three manuscripts of Petrarch's Latin prose tale at that College—gives clear evidence that the mention

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 932-938. The text followed is that in F. N. Robinson's *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston, etc., 1933, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> For the corresponding passages in the Latin and the Italian, see *Originals and Analogues of Some of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Part II, published for the Chaucer Society, London, 1875, p. 166. For information concerning the French, see my article, "Chaucer's Source MSS. for the *Clerkes Tale*," *PMLA.*, XLVII (1932), 431-452.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance: Skeat, W. W., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Oxford, 1900, v, 349; and Robinson, F. N., *op. cit.*, p. 816.

of Job at this point is not original with Chaucer. In MS. 458, exactly at the point corresponding to the position of the Job stanza in Chaucer, appears the following passage:

Verbumque beati Job compacientibus sibi respondit, "Dominus dedit, dominus abstulit; sicut domino placuit, ita factum est."<sup>4</sup>

To be sure, Chaucer did not translate the reference to Job very closely; but there can be no doubt that it suggested to him that "Men speke of Job, and moost for his humblesse," etc.

MS. 458, therefore, becomes of special interest to the Chaucer scholar. Of over sixty different manuscripts of Petrarch's Latin prose tale which I have examined in Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, and England, MS. 458 at Cambridge is the only one containing the passage above referring to Job. Unfortunately, it is a manuscript of the fifteenth century,<sup>5</sup> and so cannot have been Chaucer's direct source. Certain omissions and variants in its text also prove that Chaucer did not use it at first hand. Clearly, however, it is in some way rather closely related to his direct source. At all events, the reading in MS. 458 makes certain that the Job passage was suggested to Chaucer by a corresponding Job passage in his Latin original.

J. BURKE SEVERS

*Lehigh University*

#### GAWAIN'S LEAP: *G. G. K.* l. 2316

After Gawain had felt the edge of the Green Knight's axe

He sprit forth spenne-fote more þen a spere lenþe.

What sort of leap was this? The *NED.* relates *spenne-fote* to *ON. spennna*, clasp, and offers the conjectural meaning "with the feet close together." The translation has been considered unsatis-

<sup>4</sup> Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 458, fol. 119r. I have expanded abbreviations and added pointing. The exact position of the passage is between the words "extaret . . . quippe." See *Originals and Analogues*, p. 166, ll. 17-18.

<sup>5</sup> James, M. R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1912, II, 382-383.



factory,<sup>1</sup> but it would seem to be confirmed by two occurrences of a parallel expression in French. Thus Arthur in the *Livre d'Artus*:

Q[u]ant le rois Artus uoit que cil le tienent si cort que molt le domagent  
& empirent. & quil ne puet auenir a els. si saut en piez & embrace lescu  
& ioint les piez. si tressaut labateiz des morz dentor lui.<sup>2</sup>

Compare also Tristan's leap—*joinz pez*—from his bed to Isolt's in the *Folie Tristan*.<sup>3</sup> *Spenne-fote* is perhaps the Gawain poet's translation of *joinz pez* or the like from a French original; it certainly seems to indicate his familiarity with such a phrase.<sup>4</sup>

The "joined feet" translation is on other counts appropriate. One does not expect Gawain, a superbly trained athlete and man-at-arms, to make an awkward, sprawling leap. Such a leap would not only be ungraceful, it would be ineffective; as everyone who has tried it knows, one's distance in the standing broadjump is conditional upon his getting his feet together under him, so that they spurn the same spot of ground at precisely the same instant. This would be even more true of a jumper weighted with armor. Gawain leaps before he has had time to realize that he is still alive after the Green Knight's blow, much less to think about the manner of his leaping; but his reactions show his training.

JOHN HARRINGTON SMITH

Washington University

<sup>1</sup> Editors J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon (*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, Oxford, 1925, p. 193) relate the word to the stem of OE. *spinnan*, kick, and translate "striking out with the feet." Professor Emerson ("Notes on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*," *JEGP.*, **xxi** (1922), 407) thought that the context "required something like 'quickly,'" and suggested "a compound of Scand. *spenna*, 'spend'—or possibly OE. *spendan*—like *spend-thrift* on the one side and *hot-foot* on the other."

<sup>2</sup> *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, ed. H. Oskar Sommer (Washington, 1913), vii (*Livre d'Artus*), 17, ll. 1 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. J. Bédier (*Société des Anciens Textes Français*, 1907), Oxford MS., v. 746.

<sup>4</sup> Since this note was written I have happened upon a third occurrence in the *Roman de Merlin*. See Sommer's edition (London, 1894), p. 147, ll. 9-10.

## JOINVILLE ET LE CONSEIL TENU A ACRE EN 1250

Dans un article paru dans la *Romania*,<sup>1</sup> Henri-François Delaborde a jadis étudié un des plus beaux chapitres de la *Vie de saint Louis* de Joinville.<sup>2</sup> C'est celui qui a trait au conseil tenu à Acre en juin 1250, au moment où le roi, ayant payé sa rançon aux Sarrasins d'Egypte et ayant signé avec eux une trêve de dix ans, ne sait s'il doit retourner en France ou rester encore plus longtemps en Terre Sainte. Delaborde s'est demandé quelle était la valeur historique du récit de Joinville. Pour arriver à la déterminer, il a contrôlé les dires du sénéchal de Champagne à l'aide de deux autres textes qui racontent le même événement. Il s'agit d'une lettre latine adressée par Louis IX à ses sujets de France<sup>3</sup> et d'une chronique française connue sous le nom de *Continuation Rothelin de l'Eracles*.<sup>4</sup> Pareille confrontation, à en croire Delaborde, fait apparaître des contradictions assez fortes entre ce que dit Joinville et ce qui se trouve rapporté dans la lettre et la *Continuation Rothelin*.

Alors que la lettre royale et la *Continuation Rothelin* affirment "que la résolution de ne pas quitter la Palestine fut conseillée par presque tous les membres de l'assemblée, à l'exception d'un petit nombre,"<sup>5</sup> Joinville prétend avoir été "seul à soutenir le parti auquel Louis IX finit par se rallier, contre le sentiment unanime des conseillers." Et c'est Joinville qui serait en faute, car deux témoi-

<sup>1</sup> "Joinville et le conseil tenu à Acre en 1250," *Romania*, xxiii (1894), 148-152. Au sujet du conseil d'Acre voir aussi Bédier, *Chansons de Croisade*, Paris, 1909, n° xxiv; William Paton Ker, *Epic and Romance*, Londres, 1908, 269-274; Gaston Paris, dans *Romania*, xxii (1893), 541-547.

<sup>2</sup> Edition Natalis de Wailly, paragraphes 419-438.

<sup>3</sup> *Epistola Ludovici*, Migne PL, 155, colonnes 1287-1288.

<sup>4</sup> *HistOccCr*, II, 622-623.

<sup>5</sup> "quorum major pars concorditer asserebat, quod si nos recedere contingeret his diebus, praedictam terram dimitteremus omnino in admissionis articulo constitutam; . . . His igitur consideratis attente, praedictae terrae sanctae compatientes miseriis et pressuris, qui ad ejus subsidium veneramus, ac captivorum nostrorum captivitatibus et doloribus condolentes, licet nobis dissuaderetur a multis morari in partibus transmarinis, maluimus tamen adhuc differre passagium, . . ." (*Epistola*). "Presque tout s'accorderent à unes choses; . . . Li autre disoient, mais petit en y avoit, que il ne seroit mie bon que li roys demourast plus en la terre d'Outremer, . . ." (*Continuation Rothelin*).

gnages s'opposent au sien, et l'un d'eux est un document officiel rédigé à Acre peu après le conseil.

Delaborde, pourtant, fait de louables efforts pour concilier les deux thèses adverses, car il n'entre pas dans son dessein d'accabler Joinville. D'après lui, la décision de partir, que le roi avait d'abord prise,<sup>6</sup> n'a pu l'être qu'après consultation de ses barons, et c'est à ce conseil-là que le sénéchal de Champagne aurait été seul à soutenir qu'il fallait rester. Puis on apprend que les envoyés français chargés de réclamer en Egypte la libération stipulée des prisonniers chrétiens n'ont pas obtenu gain de cause et que du même coup la trêve se trouve compromise. D'où nécessité d'un nouveau conseil, et la situation ayant complètement changé, le roi et presque tous sont d'accord qu'on ne peut partir. Longtemps après, quand Joinville a dicté son livre, il avait oublié l'événement considérable qui avait amené un tel revirement d'opinion. Deux souvenirs surtout surnagent dans son esprit : "le rôle important qu'il avait joué dans cette journée mémorable où il s'était seul opposé au retour, et le fait que le roi avait fini par prendre le parti qu'il avait conseillé." Sans le vouloir, Joinville fond en un seul deux conseils très différents, celui qui précède l'échec des négociations et celui qui le suit. Que Joinville ait pu omettre la pierre angulaire de son édifice et laisser de côté ce qui seul donne un sens à sa construction ne choque pas outre mesure Delaborde. A l'entendre, Joinville manque de curiosité intellectuelle et de réflexion, un fait important peut parfaitement lui échapper. Mais, bien que l'ensemble du récit du conseil se trouve faussé, tous les détails en sont exacts. Joinville n'a pu les avoir inventés, car, tout autant que la faculté critique, l'imagination lui fait défaut. C'est ainsi que Delaborde, tout en voulant défendre la véracité de Joinville, porte de sensibles atteintes à l'autorité de son témoignage.

Nous croyons que dans le cas qui nous occupe l'on peut faire la part beaucoup plus belle à Joinville, et qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de le traiter en petit garçon. Il suffit pour cela d'analyser à nouveau

<sup>6</sup> "voluntatem et propositum habuimus ad partes regni Franciae revertendi, et jam disponi feceram de navigio, et aliis quae ad nostrum passageum necessaria videbantur. Sed aperte videntes . . . quod admirati praedicti aperte contra treugas veniebant, . . . requisimus consilia baronum Franciae, . . ." (*Epistola*).

les trois pièces du procès, mais peut-être d'un peu plus près que ne l'a fait Delaborde.

Et d'abord nous n'avons affaire qu'à un texte indépendant qui s'oppose au récit de Joinville: la lettre royale, car la *Continuation Rothelin* n'est qu'une compilation, inspirée souvent, il est vrai, par des documents de première main, mais qui à cet endroit précis ne fait que traduire, paraphraser ou abrégé ladite lettre de saint Louis.<sup>7</sup> La lettre ne contredit pas Joinville aussi nettement que le texte qui dérive de cette lettre et que nous avons écarté à juste titre de ce débat. Le roi parle seulement d'une majorité (*major pars*) qui veut rester, et d'une forte minorité (*multi*) qui souhaite partir. Que la *Continuation Rothelin* fût ici sans valeur, Delaborde l'ignorait, mais comme il a fait état des termes de la copie plutôt que de ceux de l'original, il n'a pas présenté le problème d'une façon exacte. Il ne s'agit pas de réconcilier deux récits diamétralement opposés: les quatre conseillers qui chez Joinville se prononcent en faveur d'un séjour plus prolongé, contre l'avis de la quasi-unanimité de l'assemblée, ne doivent pas être rapprochés des termes quasi-unanimité et petite minorité de la *Continuation Rothelin*, mais bien des termes majorité et forte minorité de la lettre de saint Louis.

On voit que l'écart apparent entre les deux versions est moindre que ne le croyait Delaborde. Pourtant cet écart semble subsister. Les quatre voix mentionnées par Joinville ne constituent pas plus une majorité qu'une quasi-unanimité de suffrages, de même qu'une quasi-unanimité de gens, partisans de la thèse contraire, ne saurait guère plus se muer en forte qu'en petite minorité.

Mais notre analyse de la lettre de saint Louis nous a conduit à faire une seconde remarque qui nous paraît compléter heureusement la première. C'est que le roi énumère les Templiers, les Hospitaliers, les chevaliers Teutoniques, les prélats et les barons du royaume de Jérusalem parmi ceux qui furent consultés par lui.<sup>8</sup> Or le senti-

<sup>7</sup> Nous en avons fait la preuve: voir *Positions des Thèses à l'Ecole des Chartes*, 1924, 76-77; *Romania*, L (1924), 427-435.

<sup>8</sup> "requisimus consilia baronum Franciae, praelatorum, domorum Templi, Hospitalium Sancti Johannis, et Sanctae Mariae Teutonicorum, baronum regni Jerosolymitani. . ." Le pluriel *consilia* reste vague. Il peut s'agir de plusieurs conseils tenus à des moments différents, et non pas nécessairement d'un conseil unique. Le texte de la *Continuation Rothelin* est plus explicite: "Il manda a un jour touz les barons de France qui la estoient et les granz hommes du pays par devant lui."

ment des chrétiens d'Outre-mer ne peut faire de doute. Du moment que la paix était compromise et que la Syrie et la Palestine pouvaient être envahies à bref délai, leur intérêt immédiat était que le roi et les barons de France prolongeassent leur séjour en Terre Sainte. Ils ont tous dû supplier saint Louis de ne point partir. Voilà peut-être la majorité (*major pars*) dont parle la lettre royale ; quant à la forte minorité (*multi*), ce seraient les barons de France, pressés de rentrer chez eux, qui l'auraient constituée. Il est parfaitement possible qu'après la désastreuse campagne d'Égypte les seigneurs et les évêques de France aient été moins nombreux que les prélats et les barons de Syrie et de Palestine.

Si nous relisons maintenant le récit de Joinville, nous voyons qu'il ne mentionne qu'un seul baron d'Outre-mer qui ait pris la parole, et, bien entendu, Jean de Jaffa conseille au roi de rester. Les autres barons qui sont nommés sont tous des barons de France. C'est à croire que Jean de Jaffa était seul de son espèce et qu'il n'assistait que par hasard à un conseil des Français de France. Et en effet lorsque Joinville résume le discours dans lequel saint Louis exposa la situation aux membres du conseil, il est dit expressément que le roi a déjà pris l'avis des barons du royaume de Jérusalem et que ceux-ci avaient prié le souverain d'ajourner son départ.<sup>9</sup>

Le récit de Joinville et la lettre de saint Louis ne sont pas contradictoires, quoiqu'ils le paraissent tout d'abord, parce que les deux narrateurs se placent à des points de vue différents. Bien qu'il écrive à son peuple, le roi parle en chef de la Croisade : barons de France et barons de Terre Sainte sont mis sur le même pied. Saint Louis n'entre pas dans le détail de ses consultations, il se borne à en indiquer le résultat final, majorité en faveur de la décision qu'il prend. Quant au sénéchal de Champagne, il ne fait que rapporter ce qui s'est passé au conseil du royaume de France. Nous ne croyons pas que sa mémoire lui ait joué de mauvais tours, qu'il mélange les faits, ou qu'il ait rien omis d'essentiel. L'ambassade qui n'obtint rien des Égyptiens n'est pas le fait liminaire, indispensable à la compréhension du récit, que veut voir en lui Delaborde. Si Joinville n'en fait pas mention, il a pourtant déjà dit par deux fois que les Sarrasins avaient violé certaines clauses de la trêve, ce qui suffit à expliquer la perplexité du roi.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Vie de saint Louis*, 434, 436.

<sup>10</sup> *Vie*, 370, 401. Voir aussi 411, 464-465.

A notre avis, le récit de Joinville est en tous points conforme à la vérité historique et n'a nullement besoin d'être corrigé et mis au point à l'aide d'autres documents. Il faut en reconnaître l'autorité aussi bien que la véracité.

ALFRED FOULET

Princeton University

## AN ERROR IN DATING A LETTER OF MONTESQUIEU

The editors of Montesquieu's correspondence have assigned to a letter to Madame Dupin the date "Mars—1744," on the basis of references which the writer makes to Voltaire's election as royal historiographer, an event which they date February, 1744.<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact Voltaire was not named historiographer until more than a year later. His letter of March 20, 1745, to D'Argenson refers to the promised appointment as still unaccomplished.<sup>2</sup> His letter of April 3, 1745 to Vauvenargues contains a reference to his new obligations in the much coveted post.<sup>3</sup> These two letters are in obvious harmony with the statement of Desnoireterres that the date of Voltaire's appointment was April 1, 1745.<sup>4</sup>

Two other contemporary events are also mentioned in the misclassified letter: the fact that Maupertuis is about to leave for Hamburg and certain "victoires du roi."<sup>5</sup> The French mathematician received the royal *brevet* authorizing his departure for the Prussian court, April 15, 1745.<sup>6</sup> On May 1, 1745, the recently appointed historiographer of France writes to the Marquis de Valori: "Monsieur de Maupertuis quitte la France pour Berlin."<sup>7</sup> This statement is evidence that the future president of Frederick's

<sup>1</sup> François Gêbelin et André Morize, *Correspondance de Montesquieu*, Paris, 1914, I, 398 ff.

<sup>2</sup> M., xxxvi, 349.

<sup>3</sup> M., xxxvi, 349-350.

<sup>4</sup> *Voltaire au château de Cirey*, Tome II of *Voltaire et la Société française*, Paris, 1868, 445. Cf. M., xxxvi, 349 f.

<sup>5</sup> Gêbelin-Morize, *op. cit.*, I, 398.

<sup>6</sup> G. Desnoireterres, *Voltaire à la cour*, Tome III of *Voltaire et la Société française*, 35, where La Beaumelle, *Vie de Maupertuis* (Paris, 1856), is cited pp. 94, 106.

<sup>7</sup> M., xxxvi, 353-355.

Academy left for Berlin at a date sufficiently beyond that of the royal *brevet* to admit of the usual preparations for a rather long voyage. Supposing Voltaire to have used the present tense with precision, in the line recounting Maupertuis' departure, we are forced to place this letter of Montesquieu to Madame Dupin after May 1, 1745. As for the "victoires du roi," Voltaire's letter to Vauvenargues, cited above, speaks of the King's intention of leaving for the Flemish campaign at the beginning of the following month (May) "pour aller nous donner la paix à force de victoires."<sup>8</sup> Louis XV did leave Paris May 8, 1745, and was present with his son at the battle of Fontenoy, where his rôle in the combat was singularly glorious. He sought and won the honor of being the first French prince since the Hundred Years' War to take the field personally against the English in the company of the Dauphin.<sup>9</sup> There was no earlier triumph of French arms in 1745 which could have been so readily called a "victoire du roi." In using the plural "des victoires," Montesquieu can hardly mean to include the capitulation of Tournay, June 20, 1745,<sup>10</sup> since the royal victory which occasioned national rejoicing all over France was at Fontenoy.

After having mentioned the fine victories of the King, he continues: ". . . et cependant nous ne voyons rien de Monsieur de Voltaire."<sup>11</sup> Montesquieu probably means by this statement that no one has seen anything from the pen of the alleged historiographer about the battle of Fontenoy, an event which ought to call forth a literary eulogium. The news of the battle of Fontenoy arrived at Versailles Wednesday evening, May 12, 1745.<sup>12</sup> May 20, Voltaire mentions having just finished the first copy of the *Poème de Fontenoy*, hastily and furiously written from the bulletins as they arrived in Paris.<sup>13</sup> Since Montesquieu does not know of the

<sup>8</sup> M., xxxvi, 350.

<sup>9</sup> M. C. Daresté, *Histoire de France depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1884), vi, 376 et seq.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> Gébélín-Morize, *op. cit.*, I, 398.

<sup>12</sup> M., xxxvi, 361. Letter of Voltaire to D'Argenson, then Minister of War, under date of "jeudi 13, à 11 heures du soir" referring to the news of Fontenoy and D'Argenson's reply in which he writes: ". . . vous aurez dû apprendre dès mercredi au soir la nouvelle dont vous nous félicitez tant."

<sup>13</sup> M., xxxvi, 364.

appearance of the poem but has the news of the victory, his letter to Madame Dupin must have been of a date between a few days after May 11 and a few days after May 20, 1745, the delay in each case depending on the time necessary for the transmission of the news to Bordeaux.

It is easy to see how the misclassification of this letter may have come about. There are in all three letters from Montesquieu to Madame Dupin, of which the first two, dated January 4<sup>14</sup> and February 25, 1744,<sup>15</sup> deal with a projected shipment of wine from the vineyards of La Brède to the Dupins in Paris. Since the third letter refers to the loss of certain wine in transit it would be natural to suppose that the wine lost was that mentioned in the two earlier letters. This was evidently not the case.

E. H. PRICE

*The Ohio State University*

#### VOLTAIRE AND BLIN DE SAINMORE: AN UNPUBLISHED VOLTAIRE LETTER

Late in the year 1761, Blin de Sainmore published *Gabrielle d'Estrées à Henri IV, héroïde*, dedicated to Voltaire. What the relations between the two authors had been before that date it is difficult to learn: Blin de Sainmore was inconspicuous, and only two letters from Voltaire to him and dated earlier than 1761 are known to have existed. Both of those are lost.<sup>1</sup>

On December 7, 1761, Voltaire wrote to Damilaville asking for the address of "ce M. Blin de Sainmore qui a fait de très-jolis vers pour moi, et qui a tant fait parler la belle Gabrielle."<sup>2</sup> Soon after that Voltaire sent off the *Stances à M. Blin de Sainmore*, which begin "Mon amour-propre est vivement flatté."<sup>3</sup>

In March or April 1764, Sainmore and Luneau de Boisgermain published their *Élite de poésies fugitives* (Paris, 3 vols.), which Grimm honored with a sour remark to the effect that this anthology

<sup>14</sup> Gébelin-Morize, *op. cit.*, I, 394.

<sup>15</sup> Gébelin-Morize, *op. cit.*, I, 397.

<sup>2</sup> Bengesco, *Bibliographie des œuvres de Voltaire*, III, 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Œuvres* (ed. Moland), XII, 574.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 532.



is no better than its numerous predecessors.<sup>4</sup> The *Élite* contains the *Épître à Voltaire* which Sainmore composed to accompany the *Gabrielle*, four other pieces by Sainmore, and twenty-six by Voltaire, including the *Stances*.

Later in the same year Voltaire had occasion to write a good deal to and about Sainmore, chiefly in connection with the Voltaire edition of Corneille. He asks Damilaville (13 juin 1764) to give a copy of the *Corneille* to Sainmore, "qui a fait un joli recueil de vers." Five days later he mentions to Damilaville a letter from Sainmore on Corneille and Racine. Then on August 9 he encloses with a letter to Damilaville one to Sainmore. On August 24 he writes to Damilaville: "Eh bien! vous voyez que de tous les gens de lettres qui m'ont écrit que je n'avais pas assez critiqué Corneille, il n'y a que M. de Blin de Sainmore qui ait pris ma défense." Finally, in connection with the *Corneille*, Voltaire writes to Sainmore himself a long letter (7 Septembre 1764) thanking him for his defence of the commentaries and encouraging him to reply to Fréron's attack on them.<sup>5</sup>

The only reference to Sainmore by Voltaire in 1765 is in a letter to Damilaville (27 février), in which Voltaire says that Sainmore has spoken of a subscription edition of Racine with commentaries. "On ne me dit point quel est l'auteur de ces commentaires, mais je souscris aveuglément."<sup>6</sup> In September of the following year (9 septembre 1766) Voltaire writes to Sainmore asking for particulars about one Robinet who has mutilated and published some of Voltaire's letters, asking also when the *Racine* is to appear.

In 1768 Sainmore, preparing to publish a new and enlarged edition of the *Élite de poésies fugitives*, must have written to Voltaire asking for anything he might be willing to contribute. As far as I have been able to discover, Voltaire's reply has not been published. I give it just as the secretary wrote it and Voltaire signed it:<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Correspondance littéraire*, etc. (ed. Tourneux), iv, 491.

<sup>5</sup> Published by F. Caussy in *le Correspondant*, 25 août 1911.

<sup>6</sup> According to the note in Voltaire, *Œuvres*, XLIII, 469, Blin de Sainmore was the author of the commentaries and sold them to Luneau de Boisgermain, who published the *Racine* in 1768. According to Lanson, *Manuel bibliographique*, etc., 5721, Boisgermain was the author of the commentaries, "attribués parfois à Blin de Sainmore."

<sup>7</sup> The letter is now in the collection of Mr. Alfred Meyer of Chicago, who has graciously allowed me to publish it.

11e 9bre 1768. au chateau de ferney par geneve

Les vieillards malades et presque aveugles, Monsieur, sont de mauvais correspondants. je ne conserve aucune de ces pièces fugitives dont vous me parlez; ce sont des bagatelles qui échappent, qui font l'amusement de la société pendant quelques jours, et dont on ne se souvient plus. on recueillait autrefois ces petits ouvrages du temps de Voiture et Sarasin, quand ils étaient raras; mais à présent on en est inondé. si j'en retrouve quelques uns, je me ferai un plaisir de vous les communiquer quelque indignes qu'ils en soient.

J'ai l'honneur d'être bien véritablement, Monsieur, vôtre très humble et très obéissant serviteur. Voltaire.

There is nothing unusual in the reference to sick and blind old men; and Voltaire had as early as 1731 coupled the names of Voiture and Sarasin when he accorded them only sixty pages in the library of the Temple du Goût.<sup>8</sup> But what is amusing—however it may have happened—is that while the first three volumes of the *Élite* (1764) contained twenty-six poems by Voltaire, volumes IV and V (1769) contain no less than seventy-six! Either Blin de Sainmore was very clever at capturing fugitive verse or else Voltaire kept a more complete collection of his own “bagatelles” than he wanted people to think he did.

No further correspondence between the two has come to light. And in 1773 Voltaire's last recorded reference to Sainmore occurs in a letter to d'Argental (30 décembre): “J'ai lu cette pauvre *Orphanis*.<sup>9</sup> Cela est très digne du siècle où nous sommes. Tout me dégoûte du théâtre, et pièces et comédiens. Sans Lekain, il faudrait donner la préférence à Gilles sur le Théâtre-Français.”

Northwestern University

WM. C. HOLBROOK

### CAMILLE AS THE TRANSLATION OF *LA DAME AUX CAMÉLIAS*

Who is responsible for the translation of *La dame aux camélias* as *Camille*? This translation has established itself absolutely in America although it is about as stupid as that of Bourdet's *Le sexe faible* into *The Sex Fable* (under this title the play enjoyed a brief

<sup>8</sup> *Œuvres*, VIII, 577. Cf. Jeannot et Colin (*Œuvres*, XXI, 239).

<sup>9</sup> Tragedy by Blin de Sainmore, performed September 25, 1773.

run in New York in 1931—translation by Jane Hinton, Brentano, 1931). In England it was published in the fifties variously as *The Lady of (or with) the Camélias*.<sup>1</sup> About one year and a half after the first performance of the play in Paris, it was presented in the United States for the first time by Jean Davenport under the title *Camille*. The text-books do not shed any light on this change of title; French writers on Dumas are, of course, not interested in the question; and his one American biographer, Henry Stanley Schwarz,<sup>2</sup> does not discuss the subject. In a recent dissertation, *American Adaptations of French Plays on the New York and Philadelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War*, Ralph H. Ware states (p. 38 f.) that "the authorship of the play (*Camille*, the version used by Miss Davenport) offers a problem."

A criticism of the translator's judgment made shortly after the first appearance of the play in America is of interest in this connection. E. J. Hincken, who published *The Camelia Lady* (a translation of Dumas' novel) in Philadelphia in 1857, says in his *Translator's Preface*:

It finally reached our own shores, and, as a result, two different translations, or rather adaptations were successively produced, the translators undertaking in both instances, with questionable taste, to change "Marguerite Gautier," the original name given by the author to the heroine, into "*Camille*." Perhaps a powerful imagination may discover some faint poetical connexion between the name "*Camille*" and the wearing of *Camélias* at an opera, (which was one of Marguerite's idiosyncrasies,) but we are inclined to regard such relation as much more mythical than real.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For an interesting account of how Modjeska fooled the London censor but not the Prince of Wales by announcing her *Camille* as *Heartsease*, cf. Helena Modjeska, *Memories and Impressions*, New York, 1910, pp. 401-404.

<sup>2</sup> *Alexandre Dumas, fils, Dramatist*, New York, 1927.

<sup>3</sup> Without a doubt Mr. Hincken referred to Jean Davenport and to Matilda Heron. They were the first to play *Camille* in this country, and both had appeared as *Camille* before 1857, the date of this criticism—Jean Davenport for the first time at the Walnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia on September 23, 1853, and Matilda Heron at the same theatre on October 3, 1855. While in Paris in 1855, Matilda Heron had translated and adapted the play for her own use (See No. CXXIX—French's Standard Drama—*CAMILLE*, in which is printed a letter from Matilda Heron to Samuel French, Esq., dated June 23, 1856). Matilda Heron's conception of the part took precedence over Jean Davenport's, and Geo. C. D. Odell in *Annals of the New York Stage*, vi, 28, says: "The public was first repelled by the story, and it was by subtle repetition that Miss Davenport won her

There is, of course, no etymological connection. The camellia, according to Webster's *Dictionary*, derives its name from Camelli, the Jesuit priest who is said to have brought the flower from the East, while the name Camille is derived from the common Latin names Camillus and Camilla.

It is interesting to note the influence of the name Camille as pertaining to *La dame aux camélias*. In a small work entitled *Girls' Names* by Henry W. Fischer, published in 1913, is the following under the name Camille:

Camille is not necessary [sic] "The Lady of the Camelias," as suggested by Alexander Dumas' great play. There is a much older name, derived from Camilla, a swiftfooted messenger of Diana. The name Camilla continues to appeal to the sentimental mothers in France.

In the Theatre Collection of the New York Public Library are a copy of Jean Davenport's prompt-book<sup>4</sup> and a copy of the adaptation which she used. Both of these books are in manuscript form. On the title page of the prompt-book is written "*Camille*" or *the fate of A Coquette in 5 acts, Property of Miss J. Davenport, Copied by Henry F. Stone*. On the title-page of the copy of the adaptation is the following: *Camille, or The Fate of a Coquette, A Play in 5 acts, Act 1st*. At the bottom of the page is written "By John Wilkens,<sup>5</sup> Author of Civilization — St. Marc etc.-etc." The title *Camille* is written in the same handwriting as that employed throughout the play. "Or The Fate of a Coquette" is in the same handwriting as the name John Wilkens. There are corrections here and there throughout the play in this latter handwriting. Since the book was Jean Davenport's personal property it seems probable that "or The Fate of a Coquette," the name John Wilkens, as well as the corrections, were written by the actress herself. A close comparison of the texts of the prompt-book and the complete play shows them to be the same version.<sup>6</sup>

way to public recognition in the part. She was the first Camille seen in the city, and, as innovator at least, must be noticed. Her rendering of the part, moreover, was as chaste and elegant as such could be; quite in contrast to that of Matilda Heron, a few years later. But, for all that, Matilda Heron is the most famous of American Camilles. It was her conception, not Jean Davenport's, that Clara Morris followed in after-years."

<sup>4</sup> This book contains only the first few lines for each speaker, whereas in the adaptation the speeches are complete.

<sup>5</sup> There is a variant spelling "Wilkins."

<sup>6</sup> Among other manuscripts in the Theatre Collection is a translation

In this same Theatre Collection is an edition by Wayne Olwine, *New York Theatre, No. X*. There is quite a difference between this edition and Miss Davenport's version both in the moral tone and in the translation of the text. If anything, the Olwine edition from a moral point of view is more conventional than the text of the adaptation used by Miss Davenport. On the title-page of this edition is the following: *Presented originally at Wheatley's Arch Street Theatre, Philad. 1856*. In as much as Jean Davenport appeared in her adaptation of the play and under the title of *Camille* three years previous to this time and was the first *Camille* to appear on the American stage and was using a version of her own which was apparently not the Olwine edition, one is quite safe in concluding that the name *Camille* was probably an invention of John Wilkens, since the latter translated the play for her. Further and quite definite evidence for this is a playbill found in the *Harvard Collection* of the Broadway Theatre:

Friday evening, December 9th (1853), will be performed for the first time in New York a new play in five acts, adapted from the French for Miss Davenport by the author of *Civilization*, etc., entitled *Camille, or the Fate of a Coquette*.

An announcement in *The Daily News* (Philadelphia) of September 23, 1853, reads:

Walnut Street Theatre—Benefit and last appearance but one of Miss Davenport on Friday, September 23d, on which occasion she will appear in a new Play, never acted in America, written expressly for her, entitled *Camille, or the Fate of a Coquette*.

In the University of Pennsylvania Library is a copy of John Wilkens' play *Civilization*. Prefacing this play, which was edited in 1854 by F. C. Wemyss, are the following remarks by the editor.

*Civilization* is the production of a young author, who, unfortunately for Dramatic Literature, sleeps in an early grave. Mr. John H. Wilkins had,

---

of the same play entitled *The Queen of the Camélias*. In addition to this title is written on the title page the following: *Translated from the french of Alexandre Dumas Junior*. Across the top on the left of the page in faded ink is written *J. B. Wright, Boston, Mass*. This was probably the name of the owner of the manuscript. Throughout this version one finds the name *Camille* used instead of that of *Marguerite Gautier*. From internal evidence one is strongly inclined to feel that the version is probably of a later date than either that of Miss Davenport or that of Miss Heron.

to use his own words, "earned golden opinions from all kinds of people"; he honestly acknowledged his play was founded upon Voltaire's "Le Huron,"<sup>7</sup> but it would have puzzled a conjuror to detect anything like plagiarism in the play. The characters are drawn with the skill of an artist confident of success—or at least conscious that he deserved it; and if W. James Anderson added to his well-earned reputation as an actor, by his performance of Hercule, to his author is he indebted, more than the author to him. In the United States, Mr. James Wallack, Jr., introduced this play at Burton's Theatre, and we have only to regret that the talented author was so early snatched from the career he had laid out for himself, and in which he gave such promise of future excellence. It would be superfluous now to say more, and we could not well, in justice, say less.

F. C. W.

From these remarks one can readily conclude that John Wilkens was very capable of translating a French play and adapting it for use on the American stage. We learn too that an early death put an end to what promised to be the successful career of a young playwright. The catalog cards of the New York Public Library list his death-date as 1853.

In addition to *Civilization* this young Englishman also wrote *St. Marc*, *The Scalp Hunter*, *The Green Hills of the West*, and *The Egyptian*, all of them, according to Professor Odell's *Annals of the New York Stage*, successfully performed in the fifties of the last century; now, however, they are quite forgotten. Literary histories or biographical dictionaries do not record John Wilkens' name, but, like Bill Stumps, he has left for posterity his one lasting mark, his translation of the title *La dame aux camélias* as *Camille*. This name is so firmly established in America that, even when Sarah Bernhardt performed the play in French, it was announced as *Camille*. John Wilkens' "Victorianized" version of the play is now no longer used, his Madame Babillard has again become the Prudence of Dumas' original, the play may be presented in a full and frank translation as in Miss Eva Le Gallienne's revival, but every Marguerite Gautier in our theater has been and probably will continue to be "Camille."

A. E. ZUCKER

P. DE F. HENDERSON

*University of Maryland*

---

<sup>7</sup> Probably the tale *L'Ingenu* is meant whose plot Wilkins' drama follows rather closely, without Voltaire's wit.

## REVIEWS

R. W. CHAMBERS, *On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School* (An Extract from the Introduction to Nicholas Harpsfield's Life of Sir Thomas More, edited by E. V. Hitchcock and R. W. Chambers). E.E.T.S., Orig. Ser. No. 186. Oxford University Press, 1932. clxxiv pages. Cloth. 6 s.

In this present monograph, which serves as an introduction to Harpsfield's life of More, Professor Chambers takes the occasion to commemorate what is almost the centenary of the Early English Text Society and in the same connection to describe the rise of English prose from the days of Alfred. The essay constitutes in fact an important supplement to the earlier chapters of the late G. P. Krapp's *Rise of English Literary Prose* (New York, 1915) and is packed with valuable comments by its distinguished author. From an objective standpoint the pages on the *Ancren Riwele* and its tradition (pp. xcvi-c) and on English prose from the fourteenth century to More (pp. ci to end) form the most significant portion of this substantial little volume; the discussion will for the time be standard and is an example of the fine critical writing we have learned to expect from Professor Chambers.

The first part of this study seems to the reviewer to be far less successful, both in exposition and in actual argument. It is largely concerned with proving three propositions: (1) that OE prose was good prose; (2) that OE prose-writing was vigorous up to the moment of the Conquest; and (3) that OE religious prose was exerting an effective influence upon ME religious prose during the latter half of the twelfth century. Now, propositions 1 and 2 are generally speaking so thoroughly accepted in Germany and America by the class of reader likely to consult Professor Chambers' monograph that one cannot but feel that much of § V on 'The Alleged Decadence of Anglo-Saxon Prose and Anglo-Saxon Civilization' (pp. lxiv-lxxx) might better have been omitted or at any rate a non-argumentative use have been made of the material therein. The conclusions set forth on pp. lxxvii-lxxx were drawn and succinctly stated by Alois Brandl as long ago as 1908:

Er war nicht ein müder Spätherbst, auf den die normannische Fremdherrschaft gleich Winterschnee fiel, sondern eine Saat mit manchen vielversprechenden Keimen (Paul's Grundriss, 2d ed., 1908, II, 1133).

Proposition 3 is difficult to debate satisfactorily within the compass of a review, but the following points may be raised. If there were any real, or, perhaps better, really substantial evidence of continuity in the tradition of English religious prose over the

period between, let us say, 1100 and 1200, one should be able to settle the matter without extensive debate and mainly on page xciii. As it is, the reviewer felt himself being gracefully guided over a parlously slender tightrope rather than led along a clear path. On pages xci, xcii, and xciii are mentioned a number of OE texts transcribed apparently in the twelfth century (on the tentative character of the dating see page xciii, note 2). Then comes the 'bridge,' in essence one statement by the author (p. xciii): 'Before the work of Æthelwold and Ælfric was forgotten, a new prose writer arose to carry on their work.' The new writer is the author of the *Riwele*, appraised as 'a greater master of prose than even Ælfric.' Regardless of the fact that the dates and often the place of copying of the OE texts in question are uncertain and that the date of the composition of the *Riwele* is much disputed, the difficulty in assuming a continuity such as Professor Chambers argues for lies, it seems to me, in the matter of what might be called transitional intelligibility. To account for the disappearance of OE historical prose-tradition the author appeals to this very point; writing of the period *ca.* 1150 he remarks that the West-Saxon chancery language of pre-Conquest times 'was now becoming unintelligible' (p. lxxxviii). This would refer, of course, to the read language, for in the spoken (popular or vulgar) speech complete continuity obviously maintained. To test the validity of this point we have open to us today one and only one obvious course. Teach someone untrained in modern linguistic science to read any or all of the early ME texts in question and then confront them with Ælfric or Alfred. I should be surprised if the subject of this practical experiment could make much out of the OE writers; certainly he would be unable to appreciate the style and latent literary tradition. For the ordinary person is not skilful at making linguistic adjustments through the eye (ME *eien*, e. g., will not be readily associated with WS *éagan* or North. *ego*, however alike *pronounced* by Ælfric and the author of the *Riwele*). Consequently, I must for the time doubt whether Jocelin's statement that the famous Abbot Sampson (died 1211) 'could read English books excellently' means, as Professor Chambers takes it, that 'the English which Sampson would read would probably be the classical pre-Conquest Old English' (p. xciv). Why not merely twelfth-century ME? Apart from spellings, syntactical differences would play a rôle, too. At all events the issue raised here clearly demands further investigation and probably along the lines suggested. It must not be forgotten that the professional student of the history of the English language cannot properly judge this matter; he knows too much, is too practised in 'guessing' and in etymologizing. A report on such an experiment would indeed be highly interesting and probably significant.

Chambers feels strongly that the eME documents in question



must rest upon a vernacular literary tradition as illustrated by the elaboration of a passage from Hugh of St. Victor by the author of the *Guardian of the Soul* (see esp. top of p. xcvi). The reviewer is ready to admit the existence of a literary tradition behind this and similar eME texts, but with the important reserve that the tradition in question may better look back to Latin (or French) than to OE. The formal principles of composition and rhetoric are in the main transferable from one European language to another, but 'style' seems to be something innate (witness the Icelanders). A native speaker of late twelfth-century spoken English, let us say a churchman endowed oratorically and trained in Latin homiletics, should not have found it difficult to elaborate on Hugh of St. Victor or anyone else. When all is said and done, Alfred does not appear to have been dependent upon an anterior tradition of native prose to produce an amount of satisfactory writing; the "episode of Cynewulf, Cyneheard, and Ósric" in the *Old-English Chronicle* is, in my opinion, almost certainly *not* evidence of an early tradition of prose-saga to which Alfred might have appealed (see p. lix and my recent article in *Anglia*).

In conclusion it may not be out of place to comment briefly on a few scattered points of varying degree of consequence. P. iv: a reference to E. N. Adams, *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800* (Yale Studies in English, LV, New Haven, 1917), would be very much in place. P. lix: to describe the simple report of the traders (rather than travellers) Óhthere and Wulfstán as 'modern' literature (in any sense) deprives the word 'modern' of much of its meaning. P. lx: is it quibbling to ask in just what sense Óhthere's sketchy report is exemplary? P. lxi: apropos of the mention of the metrical annals in various of the *Old-English Chronicle(s)* I should like to suggest that, with the exception of those poems found only in the Parker MS (Plummer's *Æ*-text), many of these metrical annals are precious examples of informal verse (others in the *Charms* and perhaps Ælfric's so-called rhythmic prose, the last despite page lxviii, note 2). P. lxvii (top): to what standard of 'correctness' is fourteenth-century alliterative verse referred? The system of alliteration is, to be sure, substantially preserved, but the feeling for quantity, an important and characteristic feature of Old Germanic poetry, is lost by that time. P. lxxvi: the oft-quoted statement from *Gunnlaugs Saga Ormstungu* should probably not be taken too literally; one must not forget that dialect speakers of the same language often have great difficulty in understanding one another. P. lxxxii: rather than example of 'no language at all' the phrase quoted from Winfield (the number could be multiplied almost infinitely) is merely a specimen of the sort of French (français) that would have become native to England had French won out as the national language (cf. Canadian French). P. lxxxvi: on the line between OE

and ME one would now refer to the exceedingly important analysis of the situation by Professor Förster in "Abt Raoul d'Escures und der spätae. 'Sermo in festis S. Marie,'" Herrig's *Archiv*, CLXII (1932), esp. p. 47, § 2. P. ci: with reference to Richard Rolle, can one properly describe his prose as 'modern' merely on the basis of word-order?

Finally it may be observed that the author raises the question of the terms 'Old English' and 'Anglo-Saxon' with reference to pre-Conquest England, making due reference to Professor Malone's numerous publications on the subject (p. v, note 2). While Professor Chambers ventures no opinion on the subject, he suggests that the use of AS "may even encourage the 'vulgar error' that the English language was a fourteenth-century creation due to the genius of Geoffrey Chaucer in compounding Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-French," in other words precisely the error implied in the report made in 1921 under the chairmanship of Sir Henry Newbolt on *The Teaching of English in England* (p. 229). Throughout the essay under review terminology based upon 'Anglo-Saxon' prevails, though somewhat erratically. We read (e. g. pp. lxiv, lxv) of 'Anglo-Saxondom,' 'Anglo-Saxon civilization,' 'Anglo-Saxon prose and poetry,' of a 'Saxonist' (i. e. a specialist in OE). Yet 'Old English poetry' appears, also 'Old English prose,' while 'Old English manuscript illumination' stands next to 'Anglo-Saxon craftsman,' and once 'classical pre-Conquest Old English' (p. xcciv) appears for Old English (i. e. chancery Old English),—*Variationstechnik* with a vengeance! On p. v the late W. P. Ker is quoted as having said "I cannot use the phrase 'Old English gentleman' without ambiguity"; there is no suggestion that the solution lies in 'pre-Conquest gentleman' (an odd locution at best); at the top of the same page 'pre-Conquest' is, however, used readily enough in connection with OE literature. To rehearse Malone's arguments would be an act of supererogation, but the reviewer is firmly persuaded that the time has come when the compound 'Anglo-Saxon' (if referring in any wise to pre-Conquest Germanic England) should be dropped and forgotten. Even the pre-Conquest chronicles in OE should, in the reviewer's opinion, be described as the *Old-English Chronicle(s)*, a terminology employed to some extent, though inconsistently, by present-day English historians. Our science is happily still young enough to relieve us of the necessity of adhering to 'tradition' where 'tradition' proves to be inexact or in any way misleading.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

*Geschichte der mittelfranzösischen Literatur. I: Vers- und Prosadichtung des 14. Jahrhunderts, Drama des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts* (zweite Auflage). Bearbeitet von STEFAN HOFER. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1933. Pp. i + 306. (*Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, begründet von GUSTAV GRÖBER. Neue Folge.)

Thirty years ago, Gröber's *Grundriss* accomplished a task of organization which answered a definite need with conspicuous timeliness. But with the several surveys of mediaeval French literature which have since become available, it is no longer to a book modelled on the *Grundriss* that one would turn for observations pertaining to literary history. Consequently, even if for no other reason, it is difficult to welcome with enthusiasm the 250 pages of discussion which Dr. Hofer has published in the first volume of a revised Gröber's *Grundriss*. *A fortiori*, the unfortunate status of such a treatise in 1933 makes more than a minimum of comment undesirable.

Dr. Hofer's chapters on fourteenth century prose and verse (pp. 3-165) cover materials handled by Gröber in various sections of pp. 729-1090 of the *Grundriss*. Dr. Hofer's treatment of dramatic literature (pp. 166-252) corresponds to pp. 1197-1247 of the 1902 edition. As he explains in the foreword, Dr. Hofer has abandoned (wisely) the geographical grouping of literary materials which characterizes the latter portion (p. 1042 ff) of his predecessor's work. Concerning the reliability of the new text, only a few random indications need be given here. Geoffrey des Nés, who receives a notice of 25 pages from Ch. V. Langlois in the *Histoire Littéraire* (xxxv, 324-48) and who was not treated cavalierly by Gröber, is given the barest mention by Dr. Hofer (p. 250) and is completely ignored in the bibliography. The "anonyme de Bayeux" (*Hist. Litt.* xxxv, 385-94) finds no place in the new *Grundriss*. Dr. Hofer (p. 89) passes quickly over the *Songe du castel* without suggesting that it may belong to the thirteenth century; he has not noted the successful edition of this poem by Miss R. D. Cornelius (*PMLA*, XLVI, 321-32). These three points, obviously, are minor details, but they are suggestive as to the quality of a work professing the completeness of Gröber's *Grundriss*. Even if such items seem trivial, there can, however, be no doubt as to the significance of the absence from a revised *Grundriss* of any mention of Nicole Bozon, Jehan de Condé, or Watriquet de Couvin. Likewise, for example, there is no mention of the *Ysopet-Avionnet* or of the *Comtesse d'Anjou*.

The uninviting style and undependable quality of the text might have been redeemed by an adequate bibliography. A well organized

bibliography, brought up to date with the same completeness originally intended by Gröber, would have more than justified the publication of Dr. Hofer's book. A few remarks will readily suggest the defective arrangement of the materials tabulated in the second part of the new *Grundriss* (pp. 253-94).

Although it is usually possible, after a fashion, to decipher the different indications in the bibliography, the unsystematic presentation leads to many inconveniences. For example, numerous references (e. g., to Nicholas da Verona, pp. 124, 264, 265) which may or may not be found in the bibliography are buried in the body of the text. A factor which further complicates control of the materials is the distribution of data (often duplicated) concerning a single author or work to different sections of the bibliography; instances include Jehan de Brisebarre (cf. pp. 260, 265, 267), Jehan de le Mote (pp. 260, 265), *Theodolet* (pp. 257, 276), Jehan de Courtecuisse (pp. 274, 275). A still more inexcusable case is that of Jehan de Cis, who is listed in the index as two separate persons (Jehan de Cis and Jean de Sy), and who appears twice in the text (pp. 79, 142) and twice in the bibliography (pp. 259, 275)—with no cross reference. The names of authors are listed with the surname first or last, indiscriminately; as a rule, this casual procedure raises little difficulty (as, p. 266, "Chalon R. et Ch. Delecourt"; note also p. 262, "Martin Deutschkron," "Blohm Hugo," and "Svetislav Stefanovic"), but when names, initials, and "S." (which can be either an initial or mean "page" or "see" at the bibliographer's pleasure) are in certain juxtapositions, the reader is entitled to his modicum of annoyance. Lastly, it should be added that the abbreviations and punctuation are incredibly careless and occasionally even misleading.

The bibliography begins with a list of periodicals, accompanied by editors' names which in many cases are no longer correct. Dr. Hofer devotes a section (p. 255) of the bibliography to manuscript catalogues; his list includes catalogues for France and Geneva, and Latham's *Oxford treasury of French literature*—whereupon he stops. Elsewhere in the bibliography he aims to provide a control of all the manuscripts of each literary work under discussion; it may be noted in passing that he has apparently made no use of the catalogue of Philipps manuscripts at Cheltenham.<sup>1</sup>

The following chance observations point to a measure of the dependability of the bibliography. Under Nicolas Oresme (p. 275), Wolowski's edition of the *Traité des monnaies* (Paris, 1864) is

<sup>1</sup> He might have recorded, for example, the manuscript (3636) of *Theseus de Cologne*, and also the three Philipps manuscripts of the *Vœux du paon* (cf. *MLN.*, XLVI, 78-84). An important manuscript of the *Vœux*, not recorded by Dr. Hofer, is the one discovered in Amsterdam by J. J. Salverda de Grave (*Studi Medievali*, nuova serie, I [1928], 422-37).

omitted. Under *Girart de Rossillon* (p. 263) there is no mention of G. M. Breuer's linguistic study (Diss. Bonn, 1884) or of E. S. Murrell's "*Girart de Roussillon*" and the "*Tristan*" poems (Chesterfield, 1926; particularly useful for its bibliography). Under the *Livre de Modus* (p. 276) there is no mention of G. Tilander. It is the life of St. Quentin by Huon le Roi (p. 268), not the life of St. Leu, which Långfors and Söderhjelm have edited (*Acta soc. scient. fenn.*, xxxviii [Helsingfors, 1909], n<sup>o</sup>. 1). The editor of Oton de Granson should be listed as G. Ludwig Schirer (p. 257; diss. Strassburg, 1904). The reference (p. 271) for the *Dit du boudin* in *Romania* (vol. xl) should be to pp. 76-80 instead of to p. 8. Professor Hamilton of Cornell is given the initials "L. G. S." (p. 257), "G. L." (p. 261), and "G. S." (p. 276). The late Dr. Stanley L. Galpin appears as "Galpen St. L." (p. 260) and as "St. L. Galpein" (also p. 260). On p. 264, Alexander the Great is endowed with a Buick.

It would be profitless to give further space to criticisms of detail in Dr. Hofer's volume in the new *Grundriss*. The essential fact, to my mind, is that the principles which have guided the form of this book are no longer opportune. On the other hand, despite its many inaccuracies and lacunae, the bibliography reflects a substantial accumulation of important data. Dr. Hofer is in an excellent position to prepare a more systematic and a more thorough bibliography; such a revision of his present work would be of distinct value to students of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

EDWARD B. HAM

Yale University

---

*A Dramatic Adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century: Les Aventures et Le Mariage de Panurge (1674) by Pousset de Montauban, with a Study of His Life and Other Plays.* By MARION F. CHEVALIER. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. 196. \$2.00. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume VI.)

This is another valuable contribution to the history of the French drama of the 17th century from the group working under Professor H. C. Lancaster. Great credit is due the editor for discovering at the library of Orleans the MS. of the play, which had lain unpublished for more than 250 years, and for her careful editing and introduction with its authoritative information about the life and works of this little known author.

The *Registre* of La Grange mentions Pousset de Montauban as the author of *Les Charmes de Félicie*, a pastoral comedy played by

the troupe of Molière in 1660. Les Frères Parfaict give some inadequate information about him, and other of his plays (*Zénobie, reine d'Arménie, Indégonde*, tragedies, *Séleucus, Le Comte de Hollande*, tragi-comedies, which were published with *Les Charmes de Félicie* in 1653), but there has been no real estimate of the author or his work until the present.

The very existence of the play now published, though alluded to under various incorrect titles, was practically forgotten. La Grange records its presentation by *la Troupe du Roi*, August 3, 1674. It had thirteen performances that year, with satisfactory receipts; in fact, the 1283 livres, 10 sols, for the first performance, is the high point of the year. It is strange that so successful a play should have remained unprinted.

Pousset de Montauban, received as *avocat au Parlement de Paris* in 1633 (the date of his birth is uncertain), won honor in his profession and was elected *bâtonnier* in 1680. He died January 16, 1685. He was renowned for his eloquence and the *esprit* which, along with classical allusions, adorned his legal pleading. He also indulged in occasional verse. Miss Chevalier finds that his early plays reveal considerable dramatic talent, conforming to the classical unities, with "a certain ability in character delineation," and an attempt to create situations, which would rank him among the dramatic authors of secondary importance. This is doubtless just, though his place would not be high in this group.

*Les Aventures et Le Mariage de Panurge* has especial significance as the first drama derived in large part from the work of Rabelais. Miss Chevalier has pointed out all the important borrowings. The names of all the characters, many incidents of the plot, and numerous phrases or verses, come directly from *Gargantua* or *Pantagruel*, mainly from books II, III, and IV. The farcical plot is original and developed with a sense for comic situation, but the reviewer cannot agree with Miss Chevalier that the author has caught the spirit of Rabelais in his depicting of Panurge and Frère Jean, the principal characters of the play, nor that the play in itself is of much value. Its chief interest, besides its use of Rabelaisian material, is in furnishing another type to aid in reaching a correct appreciation of the comedy of the century.

There should be added to the brief list of plays utilizing Rabelais, *Le Docteur de Verre*, the little farce by Quinault, forming the third act of *La Comédie sans comédie* (1654).<sup>1</sup>

C. D. ZDANOWICZ

University of Wisconsin.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fournel, *Les Contemporains de Molière*, III.

*Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et sur les Voyages* (1728),  
par B. L. DE MURALT, éditées par CHARLES GOULD. Paris:  
Champion, 1933. Pp. 381. (Bibl. Rev. Litt. comp.)

Il était temps que l'on nous donnât une nouvelle édition des *Lettres* de Muralt, ce précurseur intéressant de tant d'écrivains—y compris particulièrement Voltaire et Rousseau—qui au XVIII<sup>me</sup> siècle opposèrent l'Angleterre à la France. Celle de Greyerz et celle de Ritter, en 1897, ne répondaient plus aux exigences de l'érudition moderne, et d'ailleurs supprimaient la *Lettre sur les voyages*, qui, si elle n'est pas exactement une "admirable conclusion" à celles sur les Anglais et les Français, comme le veut l'éditeur récent, fait cependant bien partie de ce groupe des écrits de Bêat de Muralt. L'édition est intéressante aussi parce qu'elle permet de comparer les textes de l'édition de 1728—corrigée par Muralt et par place altérée—à celle de 1725 que préféraient Greyerz et Ritter justement parce que le Muralt piétiste n'était pas encore intervenu.

A vrai dire M. Gould n'a pas apporté beaucoup de nouveau à ce que l'on savait par Greyerz et Ritter, quant à la personnalité de l'auteur, et quant aux commentaires à apporter et à l'influence par G. Texte et récemment par M. Ascoli; mais on a là groupé commodément sous la même couverture et fort bien présenté, tout ce qu'il faut connaître de Muralt; et ce sont les 'notes' mises en regard du texte même qui sont précieuses surtout. Ces 'notes' et l'introduction sont en anglais (sauf les citations), et rédigées par un Anglais. On ne pourrait pas dire qu'on ne s'en aperçoit pas; les parties concernant les *Lettres sur les Anglais*, sont, en effet, les plus approfondies; et l'auteur relève avec un plaisir évident que Muralt a bien su voir *enfin* les vertus de ses compatriotes:

'Many travellers found interesting things to say about England in the first quarter of the eighteenth century: few men at that time, or since, have understood the fundamental nature of the Englishman better than Muralt' (23). Ou: 'He was no courtier imbued with Gallic culture, like St. Evremont whose long residence in England never made him one jot less French, nor a catholic abbé like Prévost, nor a witty philosopher with an ax to grind like Voltaire, but a Swiss and a protestant. His nationality is important. . . . ' Grâce à cela, il pouvait: 'set English good sense above French polish [and] admire solid virtues resembling those of his own best countrymen' (37-8). Enfin 'his sense of paradox permitted him to treat many of the vices, traditionally ascribed to the English, as virtues . . . (36).

Ceci ne devrait pas faire supposer que l'éditeur soit atteint de jingoïsme; il sait très bien relever aussi, par exemple, la juste protestation de Muralt contre la manière dont les Anglais parodiaient sans pudeur Molière sous prétexte de l'imiter (p. 29-30).

Mais d'ailleurs les *Lettres* de Muralt ont toujours contenté les Anglais plus que les Français—et c'est fort humain. Voltaire et Rousseau n'ont fait qu'imiter le procédé de Muralt en exaltant les

premiers au dépens des seconds. Et M. Gould signale une curieuse édition de 1800, où un éditeur de Metz republie les *Lettres sur les Français* dans le but de dégoûter ses compatriotes de la France des rois et pousser à la révolution (p. 54). En somme, une seule voix un peu forte s'était élevée au 18<sup>me</sup> siècle pour protester et déclarer calomnieuses ces *Lettres sur les Français*, à savoir celle de l'abbé Desfontaines (p. 63 ss.).

En parlant de la *Lettre sur les voyages*, il nous semble que M. Gould a trop appuyé sur la partie négative; en tous cas pour Rousseau les avantages des voyages l'emportent de beaucoup sur les désavantages. Les Notes, très abondantes sont, nous l'avons dit, la meilleure partie du livre; M. Gould s'y appuie pour ses nombreuses citations, surtout sur MM. Ascoli, Holsworth et les *Lettres juives*. Ici et là on aimerait, cependant, quelques indications supplémentaires; ainsi p. 319: 'De Boissy and Marivaux made great use of Muralt's ideas in their respective plays, *Le Français à Londres* and *l'Île de la raison*.' Pp. 356-7: Dans les notes relatives à la *Lettre sur les voyages*, où est Montaigne? On ne trouve pas, dans la Bibliographie, les noms de Bayle, Grimm, Locke, souvent cités; et les *Lettres juives* sont indiquées sous la lettre L et non sous le nom du Marquis d'Argens, tandis que l'on a: et *Lettres persanes* et Montesquieu; aussi: et *Misanthrope* et Molière, dans l'index. A la p. 33, il y a *Part Two* qui ne correspond à aucune *Part One*. P. 12 (note) et p. 367, est-ce bien *Der Schweizerische Protestantismus*? One would expect *Protestantismus*.

University of Pennsylvania

ALBERT SCHINZ

---

*Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans.* By CHARLES J. SISSON, MARK ECCLES, DEBORAH JONES. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. \$5.00.

This book is a happy example of collaboration between the scholars of the two great English-speaking nations. On the one hand Professor Sisson seems to have been particularly generous in sharing the fruits of his patient researches in the Public Record Office (for the book grew out of a set of photostats from the Record Office which were distributed among Professor Sisson's students at Harvard and Radcliffe); on the other hand, he was fortunate in finding two exceptionally able students to reap the full benefit of his training.

The five studies in the book present a large number of new facts, gleaned principally from contemporary law-suits. Professor Sisson writes at some length on the career of Lodge's father and its vicissitudes, of the atmosphere in which the younger Thomas grew up and eventually rebelled against, and of the numerous law-suits, including some in which his brothers were involved, into which his prodigality and his litigiousness forced him. Mr. Eccles bases his first article on the trial in the Star Chamber of Barnabe Barnes



for the attempted poisoning of one John Browne; his second is a biography of Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels. Miss Deborah Jones has patiently traced the fortunes of Ludowick Briskett's numerous relatives, and, in another article, describes a quarrel in the well-yard at St. Bartholomew's, in a house adjoining which John Lyly spent the last years of his life.

The most interesting conjecture in the book is that of Professor Sisson who, after recounting Lodge's disputes with his brother William over some property left him by his mother, suggests that Lodge has projected himself into his *Rosalynde*, and that the account of Rosader's ill-treatment at the hands of Saladyne is a piece of self-dramatisation. In other words, Shakespeare's Orlando ultimately derives from Lodge himself. It is an attractive theory, but, unhappily for the suggestion, the law-suit between the brothers did not begin until three years after the publication of the book, and, in actual fact, William was the one who had advanced Thomas money on his expectations. Thomas undoubtedly felt at the time of the quarrel that he had played Esau to his brother's Jacob, but whether there had been bad feeling before the voyage to the Canaries on which *Rosalynde* was written is a question to which no certain answer is possible.

Mr. Eccles has much interesting information to offer concerning Sir George Buc, particularly regarding his public service during the early years of his career, before he was knighted and installed in the Office of the Revels. Incidentally, he claims for Buc the account of the famous Cadiz voyage of 1596 printed in Stow's *Annals*, brings forward some interesting evidence to support the attribution to Buc of two famous title-page inscriptions, and makes clear for the first time his relationship to his kinsman and predecessor Edmund Tylney, with whom he was hardly on the friendly terms previous writers have credited him with being. At the end of his study Mr. Eccles brings us as near to a true account of the frauds of the younger George Buc as we are ever likely to get, and shows how he came to be possessed of his kinsman's manuscripts. In his other article Mr. Eccles writes entertainingly of the career of Barnes, and of the Border feuds which lay behind Barnes's singularly ill-advised and amateurish attempt at murder. He is fortunate, too, in that the Border Papers he cites seem to be written with a gusto and liveliness exceedingly rare in official reports, which are equalled, indeed, only in some of the pamphlets of the period. But he has missed one point of which something might have been made; Mr. Eccles has already turned his interest in Middleton to good account, but he has not noted that it has been shown that Barnes (who numbered amongst his friends the uncle of Middleton's wife) supplied Middleton with part of the plot of *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* through the medium of the satirical verses of Campion to which he refers.

Miss Jones's *John Lyly at St. Bartholomew's, or Much Ado about Washing* is a lively little essay of just the right proportions, but her account of *Lodowick Briskett and his Family* is somewhat overloaded with a mass of detail which, when all is said and done, can never be of any great value. Not only here, but throughout the book, one feels every now and then that the investigators tend to overload their pages with names and facts of little intrinsic importance, doubtless in the feeling that it is unwise to omit anything that may ultimately prove a link with or provide a clue to something more important. More than once, too, their attempts to enliven the dullness of some of this material savour a little of desperation. Yet even while one feels that the future student of Lodge, for instance, will probably wish to summarise rather than to elaborate the information concerning his father presented by Professor Sisson, one is grateful for so thorough a survey of the ground. And it can be safely said that each of the five men presented here is revealed as a more interesting and picturesque figure than we had previously known him to be.

R. C. BALD

*University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia*

---

*Die Bedeutung Wordsworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats.* By HERMANN ANDERS. Breslau: Trewendt & Granier, 1932. Pp. viii + 65. (Beiträge zur Anglistik, Heft 1.)

It is a difficult and dangerous task to attempt to estimate the extent of the 'influence' one poet may have exercised on another, and particularly is this the case when it is presumed to be exerted in the region of abstract thought. Dr. Anders appears determined to discover in the work of Keats a dependence on the ideas of Wordsworth which the present reviewer fails to recognize. It is certainly the fact that Keats admired and acknowledged the genius of Wordsworth; indeed it would have been unthinkable that he should fail to do so. But the two men had little in common in their attitude to poetry, and Keats owed less to Wordsworth's influence on his development than did Shelley or Byron. Dr. Anders sets out with the intention of finding links between the two men, and in order to do so, he wrests the meaning of both in order to suit his purpose. His main thesis is that Wordsworth lays down a "Lehre von den drei Zeitaltern," "Kindheit, Jugend und Reifezeit," and that these periods are adopted by Keats as necessary stages in his own mental and poetic development. Childhood, adolescence and maturity are, of course, in the ordinary sense of the terms, natural divisions in human growth, but in the special significance of the three periods

described in *Tintern Abbey* and *The Prelude* they are applied to the growth of Wordsworth's own poetic mind: he does not lay down a "Lehre" of the necessary succession of an "age of sensation," "age of feeling" and "age of thought." Again, it cannot be truly said that Keats's conception of the world as a 'vale of soul-making' has much likeness to Wordsworth's view. When Keats says that "thus does God make . . . Souls . . . of the sparks of his own essence," it is difficult to see "eine gewisse Aehnlichkeit dieser Vorstellung mit Wordsworths Ansicht vom 'active principle' das überall im Weltall lebt, besonders aber im Menschen."

Further, to specify only one more point in which we disagree with Dr. Anders, if we are to find an external influence on Keats's conception of Apollo, when "Knowledge enormous makes a god" of him, it is surely that of Milton's Christ in *Paradise Regained*. But Dr. Anders writes: "Bei Keats' Konzeption Apollos und dessen Gott-Werdung haben also offensichtlich eigenes Erleben, der durch Wordsworth angeregte Drang des jungen Dichters nach Wissen und die damit verknüpften Hoffnungen und Wünsche eine entscheidende Rolle gespielt." Keats himself explained that *Hyperion* was left a fragment because he was too much under the sway of Milton, and Mr Murry is certainly right in supposing that from that period onwards, Shakespeare's was the predominating influence on Keats.

The essay of Dr. Anders, for all its painstaking investigation, is vitiated by lack of breadth of view and by the domination of a pre-conceived theory. We do not think that it adds much to our knowledge of Keats.

EDITH J. MORLEY

*University of Reading, England*

---

*Tragic Relief.* By P. K. GUHA. Oxford University Press, 1932.  
Pp. vi + 233. \$3.00.

*Thomas May: Man of Letters, 1595-1650.* By ALAN GRIFFITH CHESTER. Philadelphia, 1932. (University of Pennsylvania dissertation.) Pp. 204.

*The "Fool of Nature" in the English Drama of Our Day.* By B. S. BRUESTLE. Philadelphia, 1932. (University of Pennsylvania dissertation.) Pp. 131.

Finding his point of departure in the Sanskrit Poetics as well as in the *Poetics* of Aristotle, Professor Guha establishes the thesis that the pain inherent in great tragedy is submerged for the audience by means of a subtle dual impression. This double im-

pression is produced by a process of "suitable distancing" which gives the audience the illusion that the events of the tragic action are close at hand yet far enough away so that the individual auditor is not possessed by a personal horror. To reach this conclusion, Professor Guha considers and rejects the theories of tragedy expressed by Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, David Hume, and Hegel because "they take little or no account of the mind and temper of the average man witnessing or reading a tragedy, and do not consider the distinctive features of dramatic art in general or of tragedy in particular." Professor Guha's own method is empirical. He reviews those tragedies that have been considered great and discovers that all of them contain this basic element of double impression as well as such other devices for softening the harshness of the tragic action as comic interludes, avoidance of the direct presentation of horror, the intervention of supernatural agencies, and a poetic elevation of the lyric note in the style. He then turns his attention to tragedies of known inferiority and discovers that it is the absence of these elements that make them poor theatre. Both in his method and in his results Professor Guha deserves commendation; his book is one of the best pieces of criticism that has come from the University of Dacca in recent years.

Doctor Chester's dissertation on Thomas May adequately fills a gap among the critical biographies of minor men of letters. The reconstruction of May's character from data that are at best meagre shows sound scholarly reasoning. The chapter on May as a translator is especially well done and can serve as a pattern for future commentators on English translation. The dissertation suffers from the usual disease—lengthy summaries and extended biographical detail about contemporaries of May. There might also be some question about some minor details such as Doctor Chester's assertion that Jonson's praising and imitation of Martial set the English epigram in a classical mould; the reviewer would like to speak a kind word for the Neo-latin epigrammatists in this connection. In spite of these minor defects, Doctor Chester's monograph is worthy of the attention of Renaissance scholars.

Doctor Bruestle's thesis on the "Fool of Nature" in contemporary drama concerns itself with the types of naïve characters in thirty modern plays. This stock character is traced back through Tom Jones and George Barnwell to the mediaeval Peredur-type. The dissertation is well below the usual standard; it is devoted almost entirely to summaries, it is badly referenced, and it is without indices.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

*State College of Washington*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

*Old Drury of Philadelphia.* By REESE D. JAMES. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932. Pp. xv + 694. *The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century.* By THOMAS CLARK POLLOCK. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993. Pp. 67. These two dissertations on the Philadelphia theatre are important additions to the series of studies of American theatrical history which have been undertaken under the guidance of Professor Quinn. The value of Mr. James's contribution lies in his publication of the text of William Burke Wood's *Diary or Daily Account Book*. The future historian of the American theatre will find this account book a repository of much interesting information on theatrical conditions in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and Alexandria during the quarter century between 1810 and 1835. It is a pity that Mr. James saw fit, for reasons not quite clear, to omit some of the entries. Thus "It has . . . been advisable to omit 'W. Warren died at Baltimore aged 66,' in Wood's entry of October 19 [1832]; 'Warren's ben(eft) declined,' in Wood's entry of November 6; and 'Mrs. Roberts died,' in Wood's entry of December 3." Again, "It has been advisable, of course, to omit this notation" ['15 May Edmund Kean died at Richmond, England.']. It would seem that source material which is made available to the scholar should be tampered with as little as possible. Mr. James's own additions, comparisons, and summaries are helpful, but, like his long introduction, they indicate little critical penetration of the material presented. Where Mr. James attempts to draw conclusions his material fails to support him, as when he cites Durang's statement, with evident agreement, that "The attractive days of an excellent stock company had passed away; a resort had to be made to stars, who absorbed all the profits" (p. 374). The entries in Wood's account book long before the season of 1822-1823, to which Durang's statement seemingly refers, with their constant featuring of the names of Francis, Payne, the Barrets, the Jeffersons, Fennell, Cooke, Cooper, Philipps, Forrest, show that the star system was well-established.

Mr. Pollock writes with a surer grasp of his materials, which he organizes competently. Believing that the Philadelphia theatre's "long struggle to final triumph throws light on many significant features of American civilization," he proceeds to show the nature of the struggle and the causes that inevitably led to the theatre's triumph. His style is compact and readable. It is perhaps his desire to be readable which accounts for his occasional indulgence, in an otherwise well-documented history, in romantic supposition,

as when he "risks" saying that "Godfrey, the young poet who was to write *The Prince of Parthia* . . . was probably at the theatre on June 10, and heard Clarkson, as Omar in *Tamerlane*, call Tamerlane a 'petty prince of Parthia.'"

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

*The Johns Hopkins University*

*Berthold Auerbachs sozialpolitischer und ethischer Liberalismus.* By M. O. ZWICK. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933. Pp. xvi, 124. Though Auerbach's views on political and economic problems outlined in this dissertation may seem a little pale at the present time, yet the author is no doubt right in his thesis (p. 125), "dasz Auerbach eine bedeutende Persönlichkeit in der Geistesgeschichte Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert war." One example illustrative of his influence told by Maude in his *Life of Tolstoy* is so striking that it might bear retelling here. Tolstoy, interested in the education of his peasants, had read Auerbach's *Ein neues Leben* in which the hero, a nobleman, devotes himself to the education of poor children, assuming for that purpose the name Eugen Baumann. When Tolstoy called on Auerbach he introduced himself with the words, "I am Eugen Baumann" in such solemn tones that Auerbach was taken aback and feared that he was about to be threatened with an action for libel. Tolstoy, however, added, "Not in name, but in character," and told what influence Auerbach's works had had on him.

A. E. ZUCKER

*University of Maryland*

*Malwida de Meysenbug, sa vie et ses amis.* By GABY VINANT. Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, Paris, 1932. Pp. 356, 21 illustrations. This dissertation written under the direction of Professor Henri Lichtenberger is frankly biographical. Its tenor is indicated by its dedication: "Aux femmes qui ne veulent être ni des poupées, ni des idoles, ni des esclaves." The author has presented a very sympathetic picture of one of the noblest figures of the feminist movement, the friend of Kinkel, Herzen, Wagner, Nietzsche, Mazzini, Bülow, and Rolland. It contains numerous previously unpublished letters. The translations are not always satisfactory, for example (p. 314), in Nietzsche's startling letter, "diese ausgesuchten Seelen" is rendered "les âmes torturées."

A. E. ZUCKER

*University of Maryland*

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Barrett, W. P.—Chart of plays 1584-1623. *Cambridge*: Univ. Press; *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. 40. 2 s. 6 d. (\$0.90) (The Shakespeare Association.)

Baskerville, C. R.; Heltzel, V. B.; Nethercot, A. H. (eds.).—Elizabethan and Stuart plays. *New York*: Holt, 1934. Pp. x + 1660. \$5.00.

Behre, Frank.—The subjunctive in Old English poetry. *Göteborg*: Wettergren and Kersbors Förlag, 1934. Pp. iv + 320. Kr. 15. (Göteborgs Högskolas Arsskrift, XL.)

Boas, F. S. (ed.).—Five Pre-Shakespearean comedies [Early Tudor Period]. *London*: Oxford U. Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1934. Pp. xviii + 343. \$0.80. (World's Classics.)

Boswell, James.—Boswell's life of Johnson with Boswell's journal of a tour to the Hebrides and Johnson's diary of a journey into North Wales. Ed. G. Birkbeck Hill. Revised by L. F. Powell in 6 vols. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1934. Vols. I-IV, pp. xlviii + 556; 543; 541; 557. \$28.00.

Bredvold, L. I.—The intellectual milieu of John Dryden. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 189. \$2.50. (U. of Mich. Publications, Lang. and Lit., XII.)

Bullough, Edward.—Italian perspectives, an inaugural lecture. *Cambridge*: U. Press; *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. 68. \$0.90.

Catel, Jean.—Poésie moderne aux États-Unis. *Paris*: Boivin et Cie, 1934. Pp. 56.

Coleridge, S. T.—Treatise on method as published in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*. Edited by Alice D. Snyder. *London*: Constable, 1934. Pp. xxviii + 92. 6 s.

De Selincourt, E.—Oxford lectures on poetry. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. 256. \$3.75.

Donatus, Sr. Mary.—Beasts and birds in the lives of the early Irish saints. *Philadelphia*: 1934. Pp. 255. (U. of Penn. diss.)

Dunlap, George Arthur.—The city in the American novel, 1789-1900. *Philadelphia*: 1934. Pp. 187. \$1.00. (U. of Penn. diss.)

Editors of The Saturday Review of Literature.—Designed for reading. *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. xviii + 616. \$2.00.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo.—Representative selections, with introduction, bibliography, and notes. Edited by Frederic I. Carpenter. *New York*: American Bk. Co., 1934. Pp. lviii + 456. \$1.50. (American Writers Series.)

Fehr, Bernhard.—Die englische Literatur der heutigen stunde als ausdrück der zielwende und der englischen kulturgemeinschaft. *Leipzig*: Tauchnitz, 1934. Pp. 96.

Feist, Robert.—Studien zur rezeption des französischen wortschatzes in mittellenglischen. *Leipzig*: Tauchnitz, 1934. Pp. xiv + 88. (Beiträge zur Englischen philologie, XXV.)

Foerster, Norman (ed.).—American poetry and prose. Revised and enlarged edition. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1934. Pp. xii + 1482. \$4.00.

Gohdes, Clarence; Baum, Paul Franklin (eds.).—Letters of William Michael Rossetti, concerning Whitman, Blake, Shelley. *Durham*: Duke U. Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 202. \$2.50.

Gover, J. E. B.; Mower, A.; Stenton, F. M., and Bonner, Arthur.—The place-names of Surrey. *Cambridge*: University Press; *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. xlvii + 446. \$7.50. (English place-name society, XI.)

Hardeland, Gertrud.—Miltons anschauungen von staat, kirche, toleranz. *Halle (Saale)*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. xvi + 174. 3 R. M. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXXI.)

Harder, Johannes Hendrik.—Observations of some tendencies of sentiment and ethics chiefly in minor poetry and essay in the eighteenth century until 1777. *Amsterdam*: Drukkerij M. J. Portielje, 1933. Pp. viii + 320.

Hartmann, Josef.—Architektur in den romanen Thomas Hardy's. *Diss. Münster*: 1934. Pp. viii + 78.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel.—Representative selections, with introduction, bibliography, and notes. Edited by Austin Warren. *New York*: American Bk. Co., 1934. Pp. xcii + 368. \$1.50. (American Writers Series.)

Hempel, P.; James, A. L.; Ogden, C. K.; Richards, I. A. (eds.).—English literary and educational review for continental readers. *Leipzig*: Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske, Summer 1934. Pp. 59-104. (V, no. 2.)

Houston, Percy Hazen, and Cooper, Charles W.—Main currents of English literature. Revised edition. *New York*: Crofts, 1934. Pp. vi + 526. \$2.50.

Jordan, Richard.—Handbuch der Mittel-Englischen grammatik. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. Pp. xiv + 298. M. 6.65.

Keal, M. J.; Clarke, J. H.; Weaver, B.—A chart of English literature. *New York*: Crofts, 1934. Pp. 14. \$0.40.

Lange, Marius.—Vom fabliau zu Boccaccio und Chaucer. *Hamburg*: Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co. M. B. H., 1934. Pp. vi + 156.

**Legouis, Émile.**—Short history of English literature. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1934. Pp. xvi + 404. \$2.00.

**Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth.**—Representative selections, with introduction, bibliography, and notes. Edited by Odell Shepard. *New York*: American Bk. Co., 1934. Pp. lxiv + 372. \$1.50. (American Writers Series.)

**Lowes, John Livingston.**—Geoffrey Chaucer and the development of his genius. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1934. Pp. x + 246. \$1.00. (Student's edition.)

**Luke, Brother Cornelius.**—The rôle of the Virgin Mary in the Coventry, York, Chester and Towneley cycles. *Washington, D. C.*: The Catholic U. of America, 1934. Pp. vi + 122.

**Lyttelton, Edward.**—The claim of our mother tongue. *London*: Oxford U. Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1934. Pp. 12. \$0.80. (Eng. Assoc. Pamphlet No. 87.)

**Marwell, Heinz.**—Thomas Percy, studien zur entstehungsgeschichte seiner werke. *Göttingen*: "Göttinger Tageblattes," 1934. Pp. 130.

**Maynard, Theodore.**—The connection between the ballade, Chaucer's modification of it, rime royal, and the Spenserian stanza. *Washington, D. C.*: Catholic U. of America, 1934. Pp. vi + 140.

**Mc Ilwraith, A. K. (ed.).**—Five Elizabethan comedies. *London*: Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. xx + 308. \$0.80. (World's Classics.)

**Moore, Cecil A. (ed.).**—Restoration literature, poetry and prose, 1660-1700. *New York*: Crofts, 1934. Pp. x + 604. \$4.00.

**Mutschmann, H.**—Further studies concerning the origin of Paradise Lost (The Matter of the Armada). *Tartu (Estonia)*: 1934. Pp. 56.

**Pinto, Vivian De Sola.**—Peter Sterry platonist and puritan, 1613-1672. *Cambridge*: U. Press; *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. xiv + 242. \$3.50.

**Plato.**—The Axiochous of, translated by Edmund Spenser. Edited by Frederick Morgan Padelford. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. x + 80. \$2.75.

**Pound, Ezra.**—A B C of reading. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 197. \$2.00.

**Purcell, James M.**—Sidney's Stella. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. 122. \$1.50.

**Rao, Ananda Y.**—A Minor Augustan, being the life and works of George, Lord Lyttelton. *Calcutta*: The Book Co., 1934. Pp. viii + 387. 12 s. 6 d.

**Smith, D. Nichol (ed.).**—Essays and

studies by the English association. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford Press], 1934. Pp. 160. \$2.75.

**Smith, Warren Hunting.**—Architecture in English fiction. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1934. Pp. 236. \$2.50. (Yale Studies in Eng., LXXXIII.)

**Spenser, Edmund.**—The Works of, A variorum edition. Eds. Edwin Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, F. M. Padleford. The Faerie Queene. Book three. Ed. F. M. Padelford. *Baltimore*: Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. x + 432. \$6.00 (sold only in sets).

**Stephens, James; Beck, Edwin L.; Snow, Royall H. (eds.).**—Victorian and later English poets. *New York*: American Bk. Co. Pp. xlii + 1164. \$4.00.

**Summers, Montague.**—The Restoration theatre. *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. xxii + 352. \$3.75.

**Taylor, George Coffin.**—Milton's use of Du Bartas. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 130. \$2.00.

**The Huntington Library.**—Bulletin No. 5. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1934. Pp. vi + 184.

**Weber, Carl J.**—In Thomas Hardy's workshop. *Waterville, Maine*: Colby College, 1934. Pp. 64. (Colby College Bulletin, Monographs: No. 6.)

**Whitney, Lois.**—Primitivism and the idea of progress in Eng. popular lit. of the eighteenth cent. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. xxii + 343. \$2.75. (Contributions to the Hist. of Primitivism.)

**Wilson, J. Dover.**—The manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet and the problems of its transmission. *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. 2 vols, xx + 435. \$4.50.

**Wolff, L.**—Dante Gabriel Rossetti. *Paris*: Didier, n. d. Pp. xvi + 320. (Les grands écrivains étrangers.)

**Yates, Frances A.**—John Florio. *Cambridge*: University Press; *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. 364. \$5.25.

**Year's Work in English Studies, vol. XIII.**—Ed. for the English Association by F. S. Boaz and Mary S. Serjeantson. *London*: Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. 348. \$2.75.

## GERMAN

**Amoretti, G. V.**—Goethe. [Profil, no. 119]. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1932. 127 pp. L. 5.

**Bassi, D.**—Mitologia germanica: gli dei e gli eroi. [Manuali Hoepli]. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1933. xix + 290 pp. L. 15.

**Belli, A.**—Il pensiero di Volfango Goethe oggi Discorso. *Venezia*: Libr. Emiliana, 1932. 32 pp.



**Bencker, Georg.** — Das deutsche Weihnachtspiel. Diss. Greifswald. *Berlin*: A. Gerhardt, 1933. ix, 68 pp.

**Bennett, E. K.** — A History of the German *Novelle* from Goethe to Thomas Mann. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1934. xiii, 296 pp. \$3.50.

**Boeschstein, Hermann.** — Das literarische Goethebild der Gegenwart in England. [Sprache u. Kultur der germ.-roman. Völker. Reihe B, Bd. 7]. *Breslau*: H. Priebe, 1933. 100 pp. M. 3.50.

**Bogner, Artur.** — Die Verbalvorsilbe *bi-* im Althochdeutschen. Diss. Hamburg. *Berlin*: Michel, 1933. 74 pp.

**Braubach, Max.** — Ernst Moritz Arndt. Rede [Bonner Akad. Reden. H. 18]. *Bonn*: Bonner Univ. Buchdr. 1934. 15 pp. 75 Pf.

**Buonocore, O.** — Wolfango Goethe. [Biblioteca de "La cultura," XIII, no. 149]. *Napoli*: Tip. Portosalvo, 1932. 40 pp.

**Chiantera, R.** — Dallo "Sturm und Drang" allo Schiller. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1933. 97 pp. L. 4.50.

**Clemen, Paul.** — Gedenkrede auf Stefan George. [Bonner akad. Reden. H. 20]. *Bonn*: Bonner Univ. Buchdr. 1934. 24 pp. M. 1.

**Darge, Elisabeth.** — Lebensbejahung in der deutschen Dichtung um 1900. [Deutschkundliche Arbeiten. A. Bd. 1]. *Breslau*: Maruschke & Berendt, 1934. 273 pp. M. 7.50.

**Darnedde, Lothar.** — Deutsche Sibyllen-Weissagung. Diss. Greifswald. *Charlottenburg*: Gebr. Hoffmann, 1933. 93 pp.

**Della Corte, A.** — La vita musicale di Goethe. [Biblioteca di cultura musicale, no. 7]. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 58 pp. L. 5.50.

**Eichler, Grete.** — Der nationale Gedanke bei Herder. Diss. *Köln*: 1934. vi, 65 pp.

**Farinelli, A.** — Goethe. Discorsi pronunciati a Weimar e a Roma: 24 marzo e 2 aprile 1932. [Reale Accademia d'Italia: celebrazioni e commemorazioni, no. 7]. *Roma*: Reale Accademia d'Italia, 1933. 65 pp. L. 5.

**Fester, Richard.** — Eros in Goethes Faust. [Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. Philos.-hist. Abt. Jg. 1933. H. 8]. *München*: C. H. Beck, 1933. 106 pp. M. 7.

**Frank, Ruth.** — Herders Frankreich-Erlebnis. Historisches und Grundsätzliches zur Frankreichkunde. Diss. Hamburg. *Zeulenroda i. Thür.*: Sporn, 1933. 79 pp.

**Freund, Hans.** — Das Fremdwort bei J. M. R. Lenz. Diss. Greifswald. *Bottrop i. W.*: Postberg, 1933. ix, 92 pp.

**Gandolfo, L.** — L'arte drammatica in Germania e la critica: anni 1932-1933. In appendice: La Duse nel giudizio di H. Suder-

mann. *Milano*: A. Milesi e figli, 1933. 213 pp. L. 10.

**Goethe.** — Onoranze romane a —. [Repr. fr. "Educazione fascista," X, n. 4]. *Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1932. 59 pp.

**Grassi, L.** — Commento alla vita di Faust. Contributo ad una concezione Goethiana della vita. *Torino*: F.lli Bocca, 1932. xvi + 476 pp. L. 42. (Biblioteca di scienze moderne, no. 113.)

**Hammes, Michael P.** — "Waldeinsamkeit." Eine Motiv- und Stiluntersuchung zur Deutschen Frühromantik, insbesondere zu Ludwig Tieck. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 95 pp.

**Helpenstein, Hans.** — Das bäuerliche Volkstum in Adalbert Stifters Erzählungen. Diss. *Köln*: Zimmermann, 1933. 94 pp.

**Hilgers, Gertrud.** — Ein neuer Typus der Lyrik. Diss. *Münster*: 1934. 47 pp.

**Hilsberg, Werner.** — Der Aufbau des Eulenspiegel-Volksbuches von 1515. Ein Beitrag zum Wesen der deutschen Schwankliteratur. Diss. Hamburg. *Düsseldorf*: Nolte, 1933. viii, 42 pp.

**Hirsch, Arnold.** — Bürgertum und Barock im deutschen Roman. Eine Untersuchung über die Entstehung des modernen Weltbildes. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Baer, 1934. 240 pp. M. 6.

**Hotzenköcherle, Rudolf.** — Der Vokalismus der Mundart von Mutten (Graubünden). Diss. Zürich. *Frauenfeld*: Huber, 1933. 284 pp.

**Ipsen, Ingeborg.** — Strophe und Lied im frühen Minnesang. [S.-A. aus PBB. Bd. 57]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. Pp. 301-413.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. Hrsg. von d. Ges. f. deu. Philologie in Berlin N. F. Bd. 11. Bibliographie 1931. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1934. vi, 247 pp. M. 16.

**Jenssen, Friedrich.** — Emsers Neues Testament in niederdeutscher Übertragung. Geschichte des Druckes, seiner Sprache und seiner Stellung innerhalb der niederdeutschen Bibelübersetzung. Diss. Rostock. *Schwerin*: Köhn, 1933. xi, 111 pp., 1 plate.

**Knoll, Friedrich-Otto.** — Die Rolle der Maria Magdalena im geistlichen Spiel des Mittelalters. Ein Beitrag zur Kultur- und Theatergeschichte Deutschlands. Diss. Greifswald. [Germanisch und Deutsch. H. 8]. 122 pp. M. 5.

**Kolaczky, Reinhold.** — Kaiser Heinrich IV. im deutschen Drama. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Tendenzliteratur. Diss. Halle. *Görlitz*: 1933. 66 pp.

**Krafft, Karl.** — Ernst Stadler, ein Beitrag zum Werden des Expressionismus. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 66, 2 pp.

**Krebs, Friedrich.**—Die Fachsprache des Maurers in der Pfalz. [Fränkische Forschungen. 3]. *Erlangen*: Palm & Enke, 1934. viii, 73 pp. M. 8.

**Kuhn, Hans.**—Zur Wortstellung und -betonung im Altgermanischen. [S.-A. aus PBB. Bd. 57]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. 109 pp.

**Kurzweil, Benedikt.**—Die Bedeutung bürgerlicher und künstlerischer Lebensform für Goethes Leben und Werk dargestellt am Faust I. Teil. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 114 pp.

**Lintzel, Martin.**—Der historische Kern der Siegfriedsage. [Historische Studien. H. 245]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 54 pp. M. 2.40.

**Lo Iacono, Provvidenza.**—Una poetessa della Baviera: Emilia Ringseis. *Catania*: Studio edit. moderno, 1933. vii + 115 pp. L. 8.

**Majoli, L.**—Il "malocchio" di Faust. Contributo a una commemorazione "non ufficiale" di W. Goethe nel primo centenario della sua morte. *Genova*: Tip. Annuari "Val," 1932. 30 pp. L. 4.

**Massmann, Ernst Heinr.**—Schwertleite und Ritterschlag. Dargestellt auf Grund der mhd. literarischen Quellen. Diss. *Hamburg*: 1932. vii, 225 pp.

**Müller, Georg.**—Staat, Volk und Recht bei Richard Wagner. *Berlin-Grünwald*: Verl. f. Staatswiss. u. Geschichte, 1934. 59 pp. M. 2.

**Niemann, Ludwig.**—Soziologie des naturalistischen Romans. [Germanische Studien. H. 148]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 116 pp. M. 4.50.

**Neumair, Paul Georg.**—Der Typus des Abenteurers in der neuen deutschen Dichtung. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 111 pp.

**Neumann, Hans.**—Das Lob der Keuschheit, ein Lehrgedicht von Johannes Rothe. Literarhistorische und sprachgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. [Palaestra. 191]. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1934. vi, 246 pp. M. 15.

**Pagano, A.**—Il viaggio in Italia e la rinascita di Volfrango Goethe. Discorso commemorativo tenuto nel real Collegio militare di Napoli il 9 maggio 1932, X. *Napoli*: Federico e Ardia, 1932. 36 pp.

**Pastorino, D.**—Popolo in pena. Letteratura tedesca; 1930-32. *Milano*: Grafica nazionale, 1933. 278 pp. L. 15.

**Paul, Hermann.**—Deutsches Wörterbuch. Vierte Aufl. von Karl Euling. Lieferung 4. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. 241-320, 4°. M. 2.

**Peacock, Ronald.**—Das Leitmotiv bei Thomas Mann. Diss. Bern. [Sprache u. Dichtung. H. 55]. *Bern*: Haupt, 1934. 68 pp. M. 2.40.

**Pehl, Theodor.**—Zacharias Werner und der Pietismus. Studien zur religiösen Lebensform des frühen Zacharias Werner. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 96 pp.

**Pfeiffer, Arthur.**—Georg Büchner. Vom Wesen der Geschichte, des Dämonischen u. Dramatischen. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Klostermann, 1934. 100 pp. M. 3.75.

**Röedl, Urban.**—Matthias Claudius. Sein Weg und seine Welt. *Berlin*: K. Wolff, 1934. 415 pp. M. 4.80.

**Rupp, Karl.**—Die Lebensbeschreibung Ludwigs III. von Arnstein. Ein Beitrag zur rheinischen Sprachgeschichte des 14./15. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Marburg. *Osterode*: Giebel & Oehlschlägel, 1933. xi, 86 pp.

**Scheibel, Gertrud.**—Rainer Maria Rilke und die bildende Kunst. Diss. *Giessen*: v. Münchow, 1933. 86 pp.

**Scheunemann, Ernst.**—"Mai und Beafior" und Hans v. Bühels "Königstochter von Frankreich." Eine vergleichende Untersuchung zur Darstellung im hohen und späten Mittelalter. [Deutschkundliche Arbeiten. A. Bd. 2]. *Breslau*: Maruschke & Berendt, 1934. 110 pp. M. 4.50.

**Schröder, Edward.**—Bibliographie, zum 75. Geburtstag am 18. Mai 1933 dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern. *Berlin*: Paul Funk [1934]. 112 pp. M. 4.20.

**Steiner, R.**—Tre saggi su Goethe. [Piccola biblioteca di scienze moderne, no. 393]. *Torino*: F.lli Bocca, 1932. 75 pp. L. 7.

**Steinmann, Ulrich.**—Das mittelniederdeutsche Mühlenlied. Eine allegorische Darstellung der Messehandlung aus dem 15. Jh. Diss. *Rostock*: 1931. 57 pp.

**Sternberg, F.**—Goethe. *Trieste*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1932. 165 pp. L. 10.

**Steuerwald, Amalie.**—Das Todesproblem in der Dichtung Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1933. 144 pp.

**Strauss, Ludwig.**—Das Problem der Gemeinschaft in Hölderlins "Hyperion." [Von deutscher Poeterey. Bd. 15]. *Leipzig*: J. J. Weber, 1933. 67 pp. M. 4.50.

**Tilgher, A.**—Etica di Goethe. *Roma*: P. Maglione, 1932. 30 pp. L. 3.

**Walter, Elise.**—Verluste auf dem Gebiet der mhd. Lyrik. [Tübinger germanistische Arbeiten. Bd. 17]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1933. 132 pp. M. 6.60.

**Weichardt, Hermann.**—Ludwig Hohenwang ein Übersetzer des 15. Jhs. Diss. Greifswald. *Neudamm*: Neumann, 1933. 125 pp.

**Weinrich, Norbert.**—Die deutsche Prosa des Dominikaners Johann Nider in seinen Vierundzwanzig goldenen Harfen. Beitrag zur Sprache des 15. Jh. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. ix, 70 pp.

Wünneberg, Rolf.—Georg Stollberg und das neuere Drama in München. Diss. *München*: Lehner, 1933. 71 pp.

Zamboni, G.—Goethe. Prefazione di E. Borrelli. [Letteratura italiana e straniera, no. 32]. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 267 pp. L. 3.

Zaniboni, Leny.—I romanzi di Ricarda Huch. Con una introduzione sulla sua personalità artistica. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1932. 142 pp.

### FRENCH

Abry, Crouzet, Bernès et Léger.—Les grands écrivains de la Fr., illustrés. Morceaux choisis et analyses. Moyen âge. *Paris*: Didier, 1934. 154 pp. Fr. 13.

Aragonnès, C.—Madeleine de Scudéry, reine du Tendre. *Paris*: Ames et visages, 1934. 256 pp. Fr. 20.

Arndt, Dora.—Juliette Adam. Diss. *Bonn*: 1933. 90 pp.

Balzac.—Letters to his family, 1809-1850, ed. W. S. Hastings. *Princeton*: Univ. Press, 1934. xxx + 482 pp.

Barton, F. B. (ed.).—Les trois mousquetaires, Perrichon, Colomba, Atala. *Boston*: Heath, 1934. 505 pp. \$1.60.

Baudelaire.—Fleurs du mal, éd. La Dantec. *Paris*: Eds. de Cluny, 1933. vii + 325 pp.

Bejot, A.—L'Évolution poétique en Fr. *Paris*: Lemerre, 1933. 252 pp. Fr. 15.

Bement, N. S.—Fr. modal syntax in the sixteenth century. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1934. xvi + 168 pp. \$2.50. (U. of Mich. Pubs. in Lang. and Lit.)

Bossuet.—Oraison funèbre d'Henriette d'Angleterre, éd. A. Garric. *Paris*: de Gigord, 1933. 72 pp.

Bovée and Lindquist.—Une aventure en français. *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, 1934. xxiii + 543 pp. \$1.72.

Champion, E.—La Comédie fr., 1927-1932. *Paris*: Daupéley-Gouverneur, 1934. xii + 464 pp. Fr. 90.

Chinard, G.—Petite hist. des lettres fr. New ed. *Boston*: Ginn, 1934. viii + 343 pp. \$1.50.

Cummings, F. J.—Caesar's vocabulary as reflected in French. Diss. *U. of Penn.*: 1934. 81 pp.

Druel, A.—Romans fr. du moyen âge. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 450 pp. Fr. 24.

Durrière, G.—Jules Lemaître et le théâtre. *Paris*: Boivin (1934). iii + 323 pp.

Falk, Paul.—Jusque et autres termes en ancien fr. et en ancien prov. marquant le point d'arrivée. *Uppsala diss.*: 1934. 218 pp.

Faral, E.—La Chanson de Roland, étude et analyse. *Paris*: Mellottée, 1934. 335 pp. Fr. 20.

—Le MS. 19152 du fonds fr. de la Bibl. Nat. reproduit phototypique publ. avec une introd. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 504 pp. + 206 sheets.

Goedecke, R.—Der philosophische Gehalt in R. de Gourmonts Gesamtwerk. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1933. 63 pp.

Gräf, Hermann.—Der Parallelismus im Rolandslied. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1931. 43 pp.

Grant, E. M.—Chief Fr. Plays of the nineteenth century. *New York*: Harper, 1934. 934 pp. \$2.50.

Groos et Truc.—Tableau du XX<sup>e</sup> s. Lettres. *Paris*: Denoël et Steele, 1934. 400 pp. Fr. 20.

Guilhou, E.—L'Abbé Prévost en Hollande. *Paris*: Nizet et Bastard, 1934. 47 pp. Fr. 10.

Hendel, C. W.—Jean-Jacques Rousseau moralist. 2 vols. *London and New York*: Oxford Press, 1934. xii + 316 + 348 pp. \$7.50.

Holmes, U. T. and Schutz, A. H.—A Hist. of the Fr. Lang. *Columbus*: Hedrick, 1934. 190 pp.

Hugo.—Marion Delorme, ed. Maxwell A. and M. R. Smith. *New York*: Appleton-Century, 1934. xxvi + 258 pp.

Irvin, L. P. and King, D. L.—Vingt et un contes. *New York*: Harper, 1934. 400 pp. \$1.40.

Jolly, Maria.—Die Stilmittel A. Daudets in der Schilderung der Provence. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1931. ii + 65 pp.

Jones, J. David.—La Tenson provençale suiv. d'une éd. crit. de 4 tensons et une liste complète des tensons prov. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 113 pp.

Kellermann, W.—Studien zu Charles-Louis Philippe. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1931. 61 pp.

Kuhn, H.—Michelets Landschaftsschilderung in "La Mer" und "La Montagne." Diss. *Würzburg*: 1933. 55 pp.

Larnac, J.—Louise Labé. *Paris*: Firmin-Didot, 1934. 216 pp. Fr. 15.

Lichtenstein, J.—Racine poète biblique. Neuchâtel diss. *Paris*: Lipschutz, 1933. 250 pp.

Löffel, K.—Beiträge zur Geschichte von montjoie. Diss. *Tübingen*: 1934. 67 pp.

Longi, Olga.—La Terre et les Morts dans l'œuvre de Chateaubriand. *Baltimore*: J. H. Press, 1934. 138 pp. \$1.25. (J. H. Studies in Romance L. and L., 23.)

Lorde, A. de.—Trois pièces d'épouvante, ed. M. E. Coindreau. *New York*: Holt, 1934. xxiv + 136 + xxx pp. \$0.96.

Meyer, L.—Les légendes des matières de Rome, de France et de Bretagne dans le "Panthéon" de Godefroi de Viterbe. *Paris*: Boccard, 1934. xix + 247 pp. Fr. 25.

Münz, W.—Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Entwicklung von s + Konsonant im Französischen. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1932. 63 pp.

Palamountain, J. C. and B. S.—Learning Fr. from modern writers. *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. xii + 280 pp. \$1.60.

Passion d'Autun, la, pub. par Grace Frank. *Paris*: Soc. des auc. textes fr., 1934. 234 pp.

Plate, H.—Die Suffixe -ura, -or, -tudo und -tas im Französischen. Diss. *Königsberg*: 1928. 85 pp.

Pope, M. K.—From Latin to Modern Fr. with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman. *Manchester*: University Press, 1934. xxx + 571 pp. 10/6 s.

Rabelais. — Œuvres complètes, éd. J. Boulenger. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. fr., 1934. 1045 pp. Fr. 68.

Racine.—Andromaque, Britannicus, Phèdre, ed. H. C. Lancaster and E. A. Méras. *New York*: Scribner's 1934. xxvi + 247 pp. \$1.00.

Reichert, Madeleine.—Les sources allemandes des œuvres poétiques d'André van Hasselt. *Brussels*: Palais des Académies, 1933. 247 pp. (Méms. de l'Acad. royale de l. et l. fr. de Belgique, VIII.)

Roman des Sept Sages, le, ed. Jean Misrahi. Columbia diss. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. xxiv + 147 pp.

Sänger, H.—Juden und Altes Testament bei Diderot. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1933. 133 pp.

Schienenmann, W.—Anatole Le Braz und die Bretonen. Diss. *Königsberg*: 1933. 79 pp.

Schinz, A.—Nineteenth Century Fr. Readings. Romanticism (1789-1848). *New York*: Holt, 1934. xxii + 616 pp. \$1.88.

Schmitt, R.—Der Pseudoturpin Harley 273. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1933. 95 pp.

Schüll, E.—César Birotteau. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1932. 59 pp.

Schweickert, E.—P. Loti und A. Gide, zwei Arten von Exotisten. Diss. *Munich*: 1932. 57 pp.

Skinner, L. H.—Collin d'Harleville Dramatist, 1755-1806. Columbia diss. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933. 202 pp.

Spiegel, E.—Emile Clermont (1880-1916). Diss. *Würzburg*: 1932. 67 pp.

Stendhal.—Correspondance, ed. H. Martineau. 3 vol. *Paris*: Divan, 1933. xix + 378 + 402 + 349 pp.

Stolle, H.—Das Komische bei Gondinet. Diss. *Rostock*: 1933. 149 pp.

Thomas, J. H.—L'Angleterre dans l'œuvre de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 245 pp.

Toudouze, G. G.—Le petit roy d'Ys, ed. Michael West. *Chicago*: U. of Ch. Press, 1934. xvi + 144 pp. \$1.00.

Turner, R. E.—The Sixteenth Century in V. Hugo's Inspiration. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1934. 65 pp.

Van der Tuin, H.—L'Evolution psychologique, esthétique et littéraire de Th. Gautier. *Paris*: Nizet et Bastard, 1934. 309 pp. Fr. 50.

Vaugelas.—Remarques sur la langue fr., fac simile de l'éd. orig. Ed. par Jeanne Streicher. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 732 pp. (Soc. des textes fr. mod.)

Vigneulles, Ph. de.—La Chronique, éd. Ch. Bruneau. T. 4. *Metz*: Soc. d'histoire de la Lorraine, 1933. 559 pp.

Wace.—The Conception Nostre Dame, ed. W. R. Ashford. Diss. *Chicago*: 1933. xxviii + 111 pp.

Weiss, K.—Die Landschaftsschilderung bei A. Theuriet. Diss. *Rostock*: 1933. 180 pp.

Weith, Otto.—Romantisches im Theater H. de Balzac's. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1931. 79 pp.

Werkmann, M.—Bretagne und Bretonen bei Pierre Loti. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1933. 78 pp.

Williams, E. B.—Maupassant for Rapid Reading. *New York*: Crofts, 1934. xiv + 178 pp. \$1.20.

## ITALIAN

Acutis, G.—Albordi del romanticismo in Piemonte. *Torino*: V. Briscioli, 1933. 207 pp. L. 10.

Alfieri, Vittorio.—La congiura de' Pazzi. Con introduzione e commento di E. D'Avanzo. *Napoli*: A. Rondonella, 1934. 172 pp. L. 5.

—Saul, Agamennone, Oreste, Bruto Secondo, Filippo: tragedia. Con introduzione di A. Farinelli. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. xxvii + 237 pp. L. 7. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Alighieri, Dante.—Il poema di Dante in prosa a cura di G. Amoretti. Vol. I: l'Inferno. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 173 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, n. 187-188.)

—La Divina Commedia. Parafrasi e note di G. Monetti. Purgatorio. *Alba-Roma*: "San Paolo," 1932. 352 pp. L. 8. (Collana di coltura classica.)

—La Divina Commedia. Commentata da G. A. Venturi. I: Inferno. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1932. 208 pp. L. 5.

Almanacco letterario 1933. *Milano*: V. Bompiani, 1933. 384 pp. L. 12.

**Ambrosi, G.**—Pagine letterarie. Con prefazione di V. Rossi. *Foligno*: T. Sbrozzi e figlio, 1933. 175 pp. L. 6.

**Ariosto, Lodovico.**—La Cassaria. Il Negromante: commedie. *Milano*: Sonzogno, 1933. 117 pp. L. 1.20. (Biblioteca universale, no. 31.)

**Avancini, A.**—Storia letteraria d'Italia dal 1800 ai nostri giorni. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1933. viii + 667 pp. (Repr. fr. "Il popolo italiano nella storia della libertà e della grandezza della patria dal 1800 ai nostri giorni.")

**Azaretti, E., e Rostau, F.**—A Barma grande. Antulugia intemelìa. Libru primu. *Ventimiglia*: E. Bonzano, 1932. 62 pp. L. 10.

**Balestrazzi, A.**—Il romanzo di Salvatore Farina. *Pavia*: Istituto tecnico pareggiato A. Bellani, 1933. 62 pp.

**Basilone, G.**—Guida allo studio della Divina Commedia. I, l'Inferno. Per gli alunni delle scuole medie. *Napoli*: P. Federico e G. Ardia, 1933. 159 pp. L. 5.

**Belloni, A.**—L'umano e il divino nei Promessi sposi. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 215 pp. L. 10.50. (Biblioteca Paravia "Storia e pensiero," n. 20.)

—Scrittori del secolo XIII. Antologia. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 112 pp. L. 5.20. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

**Bertacchi, G.**—Lezioni di letteratura italiana, tenute nell'anno accademico 1932-33 (r. Università di Padova). *Padova*: G. Parisotto, 1933. 7 fasc., 375 pp.

**Biancotti, A.**—Paolo Boselli. Vita. Con prefazione di A. Foà e ritratto di L. Bistolfi. *Torino*: S. Lattes e C., 1932. xv + 234 pp. L. 12.

**Boccaccio, Giovanni.**—Il Decameron. Ricontrato co' migliori testi, e con note di P. Fanfani, E. Camerini ed altri. Vol. I. *Milano*: Sonzogno, 1933. 336 pp. L. 4. (Biblioteca classica economica, n. 27.)

**Boiardo, Matteo Maria.**—Passi scelti da l'Orlando innamorato e dal Canzoniere. Con introduzione e note a cura di I. Riboni. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1933. 109 pp.

**Bonacchi, G.**—Nel secolo dell'umanesimo. Contrasti letterari. *Pistoia*: A. Pacinotti, e C., 1933. 77 pp. L. 9.

**Bontempo, B.**—Uno scrittore del sentimento: Luigi Fiorentino. *Trapani*: "L'aquila imperiale," 1933. 19 pp. L. 3.

**Borrelli, P.**—La lirica di Vincenzo Padula. *Milano*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1933. 48 pp. L. 3.

**Bruno, F.**—Problemi e figure della nuova poesia. *Palermo*: "La tradizione," 1933. 156 pp. L. 10.

**Bruno, Giordano.**—Documenti delle vita di —. A cura di V. Spampinato. *Firenze*: L. S. Olshki, 1933. 235 pp. (Opuscoli filosofici. Testi e documenti inediti o rari pubblicati da G. Gentile, IV.)

**Buonarroti, Michelangelo.**—Le rime. Con introduzione e commento di A. Dobelli. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 215 pp. L. 8. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 39.)

**Calderaro, F.**—Vita vissuta: corso di storia per i licei e gli istituti magistrali ricostruita attraverso documenti ed interpretazioni dei maggiori poeti e prosatori. Volume I. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1933. 427 pp. L. 12. (Collezione scolastica "La nuova Italia.")

**Ceci, A.**—Contributo alla storia della civiltà italiana. Toponomastica della Sicilia antichissima. *Roma*: G. Bardi, 1932. 94 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche della R. Accademia nazionale dei Lincei," ser. VI, vol. VIII, fasc. 3-4.)

**Ciau, V.**—La maggior fortuna di Dante. Appunti storici. *Torino*: Tip. L. Anfossi, 1932. 19 pp.

**Compagnoni, G. A.**—Raccolta di voci romane e marchiane riprodotta secondo la stampa del 1768, a cura di —, con prefazione di C. Merlo. *Roma*: Soc. filologica romane, 1932. xviii + 89 pp. L. 30. (I dialetti di Roma e del Lazio, n. 6.)

**Croce, B.**—Commento storico a un carne satirico di Giacomo Leopardi. *Bari*: G. Laterza, 1933. 36 pp.

**D'Amico, S.**—Il teatro italiano. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1932. 327 pp. L. 12. (Il teatro del novecento. Collezione critica di "Scenario," diretta da S. D'Amico, I.)

**Davoli, A.**—La preziosa collezione ariosteana della private libreria Davoli di Reggio d'Emilia. *Reggio d'Emilia*: Scuola di bibliografia italiana, 1933. 64 pp. (Scritti della scuola di bibliografia italiana, n. 25.)

**D'Azeglio, Massimo.**—Nicolò de' Lapi: romanzo. *Milano*: Bietti, 1933. 2 vols., 256, 224 pp. L. 3.50 each volume. (Biblioteca "Réclame," no. 125-126.)

**Di Domenico, F.**—Catechesi dantesca. Lezioni di religione cattolica illustrate dalla Divina Commedia, con annotazioni di coltura varia per seminari e scuole medie superiori. *Caserta*: G. Maffei, 1933. xvi + 344 pp. L. 8.

**Di Roccanti, L.**—ò biografato Alberto Donzelli. *Napoli*: "Vulcania," 1933. 63 pp. L. 4.

**D'Ovidio, F.**—Le correzioni ai Promessi Sposi e la questione della lingua. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1933. xv + 246 pp. L. 15. (Opere, no. 8.)

**Fimiani, R.**—Lirici italiani del dugento. Con introduzione e note di —. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1932. 159 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca di letteratura, n. 168-170.)

**Foligno, D.**—Ugo Foscolo. Il pensiero politico e le influenze del Machiavelli. Prefazione di C. Curcio. *Napoli*: A. Chiurazzi e figlio, 1933. 48 pp. L. 3.50. (Politica, economia, corporativismo. Collana diretta da R. Caniglia, n. 12.)

**Foscolo, Ugo.**—Ultime lettere di Jacopo Ortis. Con introduzione a cura di A. Gustarelli. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 118 pp. L. 4. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 42.)

**Galizzi, P. G.**—Poemetti cristiani di Giovanni Pascoli interpretati e ridotti. *Crema*: Buona stampa, 1933. 32 pp.

**Pascoli, Giovanni.**—I ricordi di Sogliano per —. *Sogliano al Rubicone*: Botticelli e Tomassini, 1933. 59 pp. L. 5.

— Studi pascoliani, a cura della società italiana —. III. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1933. 96 pp.

**Patriarca, E.**—Giulio Liliano oratore e poeta. *Udine*: Arti graf. Friulane, 1933. 31 pp.

**Piccagli, A.**—Impressioni estetiche d'ogni canto della Divina Commedia. *Torino*: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1933. 87 pp. L. 2.

**Piggioli, F.**—Antonio Fogazzaro (1842-1911). Con brani scelti di A. Fogazzaro. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1933. 103 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

**Prati, Giovanni.**—Liriche scelte; a cura di M. Lupo Gentile. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1932. 140 pp. L. 3.50 (I grandi scrittori.)

**Razzi, M. G.**—La Cecca. Commedia. A cura di L. D'Orsi. *Padova*: "La Garangola," 1933. 112 pp. L. 10.

**Rezé, Geneviève.**—Lamartine et l'Italie. *Napoli*: A. Amoroso, 1933. 40 pp.

**Rinaudo, Caterina.**—G. Leopardi e G. Pascoli. *Palermo*: Tip. F.lli Vena e C., 1933. 91 pp.

**Rizzi, F., e Cerini, M.**—I classici minori. Supplemento ai volumi primo e secondo, a cura di —. Jacopo Sannazzaro, Giovanni Della Casa, Lirici del 500, G. B. Marino, Daniello Bartoli, Paolo Segneri. *Catania*: Studio editoriale moderno, 1931. vi + 99 pp. L. 4.50.

**Ronzoni, D.**—Il pensiero e il gusto estetico in Italia dal medio evo ai nostri giorni. *Torino*: Soc. editr. internazionale, 1932. 86 pp. L. 4.

**Rota, E.**—Il riso di Carlo Porta e il giansenismo: per l'interpretazione delle satire contro il clero. *Milano*: "Famiglia meneghina," 1933. 130 pp.

**Soavi, G., e Rovere, G.**—Paolo Boselli e il Piemonte. Con prefazione di C. Assum. *Torino*: S. Lattes e C., 1933. 167 pp. L. 10.

**Susmel, E.**—Antonio Grossich nella vita del suo tempo, 1849-1926. Con prefazione di G. Giuriati e scritti inediti di G. D'Annunzio. *Milano-Roma*: Treves, Treccani, Tumminelli, 1933. viii + 290 pp. L. 15.

**Vidoni, R.**—Leggende delle Alpi Giulie *Udine*: Soc. filologica friulana, 1933. 29 pp.

**Zitarosa, G. R.**—Lodovico Ariosto. *Napoli*: Istituto meridionale di cultura, 1933. 56 pp. L. 3.50.

## SPANISH

**Andersson, Theodore.**—Carlos María Ocantos, Argentine novelist, a study of indigenous French and Spanish elements in his work. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1934. xii + 136 pp. \$1.50.

**Coloma, Luis.**—Boy, ed. M. B. Deily. *New York*: Bruce, 1934. xiv + 214 pp. \$1.12.

**Wilson, W. E.**—Spanish short stories and sketches. *New York*: Harper, 1934. xx + 246 pp.

## GENERAL

**Anderson, F.**—A primer of Romance philology in the form of a syllabus. *Stanford*: Univ. Press, 1934. 15 pp. \$0.35.

**Caplan, Henry.**—Mediaeval *Artes praedicandi*, a hand-list. *Ithaca, N. Y.*: Cornell Univ. Press, 1934. 52 pp. \$1.50. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology.)

**Cornford, F. M.**—The Origin of Attic Comedy. 2nd impression. *Cambridge*: Univ. Press [New York: Macmillan], 1934. xii + 252 pp. \$3.00.

**Duméril, E.**—Le lied allemand et ses trads. poétiques en Fr. *Paris*: Champion, 1934. 402 pp. Fr. 55. (Bibl. de la RLC.)

**Eggenschwiller, E.**—Die Namen der Fledermaus auf dem franz. und ital. Sprachgebiet. *Leipzig*: Vogel, 1934. 299 pp. 19 charts. M. 8.

**Entwistle, W. J., etc.**—The Year's Work in Modern Lang. Studies. Vol. IV. *New York and London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1934. 206 pp. \$2.50.

**Hallig, R.**—Die Benennungen der Bachstelze in den romanischen Sprachen und Mundarten. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1933. xvi + 101 pp.

**Homer.**—The Odyssey, trans. into English prose by T. E. Shaw. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1934. 327 pp. \$1.35.

**Keyser, S.**—Contribution à l'étude de la fortune litt. de l'Arioste en Fr. *Paris*: Nizet et Bastard, 1934. 225 pp. Fr. 50.

**Schlauch, M.**—Romance in Iceland. *Princeton*: Univ. Press, 1934. 205 pp. \$2.00. (American Scandinavian Foundation.)

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIX

DECEMBER, 1934

Number 8

---

## THOMAS HANMER AND THE ANONYMOUS ESSAY ON *HAMLET*

The quite notable anonymous essay on *Hamlet* of 1736<sup>1</sup> has been attributed to Thomas Hanmer solely because of a tentative remark in Sir Henry Bunbury's *Memoir*.<sup>2</sup> Yet there is strong evidence that Hanmer could have had nothing to do with the essay. If this evidence is not conclusive, it is at least sufficient to establish a doubt too strong to be ignored.

Hanmer's attitude toward Pope and Theobald is not that of the anonymous author. Hanmer is a disciple of Pope; 'Anonymous' accepts Theobald. Hanmer's professed aim in his edition was to support Pope in restoring Shakespeare's original text. He spoke warmly of Pope's judgment as editor and followed his example in

<sup>1</sup> *Some Remarks on the Tragedy of Hamlet*, London, 1736.

<sup>2</sup> *Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hanmer, with A Memoir of His Life*, Ed. Sir Henry Bunbury, London, 1838. "I have reason to believe," Bunbury writes, "that he was the author of some works which were published anonymously, and have been attributed to other writers; particularly a Review of *Paradise Lost*, 'in which the chief of Dr. Bentley's emendations are considered,' printed in 1733; and *Remarks on the Tragedy of Hamlet*, published in 1736" ("Memoir," 79-80). Bunbury also assumes that Pope's attack on Hanmer in *The Dunciad* was caused by the passage in the *Remarks* in which the author depreciates Pope as editor and critic. "I suspect that in spite of the deprecating assurance, that the writer regarded Pope as the first of English poets, this comparison . . . was the occasion of my worthy ancestor's being dragged into the Fourth Book of the *Dunciad*, though Warburton afterwards tried to make it appear as an offering of friendship and justice to himself" ("Memoir," 81-82).

The *DNB.*, probably following Bunbury, assigns the essay without qualification to Hanmer. Professor D. Nichol Smith, clearly on the word of Bunbury, accepts with every evidence of certainty the tradition of Hanmer as author (*Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare*, Glasgow, 1903, pp. xx and liii). Professor Raysor ("The Downfall of the Unities," *MLN.*, XLII, 2) notes that this essay has been attributed to Thomas Hanmer, and

relegating to footnotes passages which Theobald had restored;<sup>3</sup> he even reprinted Pope's Preface with his own. He did not, as Warburton splenetically charged, ignore Theobald's edition, for he at times adopted his detailed readings. But such debts were not acknowledged. Theobald is not even mentioned in the Preface, except as he is included by implication among those editors who, contrary to the good example of Pope, have helped mutilate Shakespeare. So far as known opinion is concerned then, Hanmer inclines decisively to Pope.<sup>4</sup> In contrast, the author of *Some Remarks*, though acknowledging Pope's genius as a poet, definitely rejected him as a critic and editor in favor of Theobald:

In the Course of these Remarks, I shall make use of the Edition of this Poet, given us by *Mr. Theobalds* because he is generally thought to have understood our Author best, and certainly deserves the Applause of all his Countrymen for the great Pains he has been at to give us the best Edition of this Poet which has yet appear'd. I would not have Mr. Pope offended at what I say, for I look upon him as the greatest genius in Poetry that has ever appear'd in England: But the Province of an Editor and a Com-

---

adds that Lounsbury "without offering evidence . . . questions the attribution." Elsewhere, he guardedly places a question mark after each mention of Hanmer in connection with the *Remarks* (see Coleridge's *Shakespearian Criticism*, I, pp. xviii and 41). Mr. R. W. Babcock (*The Genesis of Shakespearian Idolatry*, University of North Carolina Press, 1931) is less cautious. He does put a question mark after Hanmer's name as author of the *Remarks* (Appendix A, p. 249), but in the text he regularly attributes to Hanmer statements cited from the essay (pp. 5, 6, 7), with only a first note reading, 'This text is generally attributed to Hanmer.' Of important critics, only Lounsbury has seriously challenged Bunbury's word. Hanmer's authorship of the essay, he declares, "is so improbable that it may be called impossible. The sentiments expressed in it are not Hanmer's sentiments" (*Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, 60).

<sup>3</sup> For example, see *Hamlet*, the twenty lines beginning "This heavy-headed revel," I, vii (Hanmer, VI, 338). Hanmer not only throws this passage to the bottom of the page, but quotes Pope's note verbatim. Similar instances of such deference to Pope's judgment may be found in *Romeo and Juliet*, I, iv, v and vi, and II, vi (v in Pope). Pope had in each case rejected the passage, Theobald had restored it; Hanmer had followed Pope in rejecting it.

<sup>4</sup> Bunbury ignores such evidence entirely. Of the incompatibility in his belief in Hanmer's authorship of the *Remarks* and Hanmer's obvious preference for Pope in the 1744 Edition, he seems blissfully unaware, as is shown in his fatuous comment, "The [Hanmer's] preference given to Theobald's compared with Pope's edition, is avowed in the remarks on *Hamlet* which I have before mentioned" ("Memoir," 81, 82).



mentator is quite foreign to that of a Poet. The former endeavours to give us an Author as he is; the latter, by the Correctness and Excellency of his own Genius, is often tempted to give us an Author as he thinks he ought to be.<sup>5</sup>

It is highly improbable that the Hanmer who so openly proclaimed allegiance to Pope in his edition and preface could have written this. Nor is there evidence that Hanmer changed his mind on Pope between 1736 and the time his edition was published in 1744.<sup>6</sup>

Of less importance, yet of significance, is the admiration of 'Anonymous' for Addison. He considers Addison "the true Model for all Criticks to follow,"<sup>7</sup> frankly sets out, in presenting his author, to emulate his example, and even adopts his general style of writing. This is incompatible with Hanmer's preference for Pope as a critic. Moreover, Hanmer gives no evidence in his known works of having been at all impressed by Addison's ideas or his methods, certainly not as were many of his contemporaries, Theobald, in case, who not only quotes Addison as a celebrated writer on Milton,<sup>8</sup> but follows him in some of his critical principles.<sup>9</sup> Such a difference in allegiance suggests that 'Anonymous' and Hanmer were temperamentally diverse.

<sup>5</sup> *Some Remarks*, 3. Contrast these words with the following sentences from Hanmer's Preface: "From what causes it proceeded that the works of this Author in the first publication of them were more injured and abused than perhaps any that ever pass'd the Press, hath been sufficiently explained in the Preface to Mr. Pope's Edition which is here subjoined, and there needs no more to be said upon that subject. . . . Most of those passages are here thrown to the bottom of the page and rejected as spurious, which were stigmatized as such in Mr. Pope's Edition; and it were to be wished that more had then undergone the same sentence."

A further example of this contrast in attitudes is the treatment of the passage in *Hamlet*, I, vii, descriptive of the king's rouse, beginning "This heavy-headed revel." Hanmer, like Pope, throws it out, as "too verbose" (VII, 338). "Anonymous" does not much like the speech but sees it as dramatically necessary, and approves Theobald for retaining it (p. 27).

<sup>6</sup> Hanmer was working on his edition, in which he continually paid honor to Pope, at least from 1737 to its publication. Warburton wrote to the Rev. Thomas Birch on October, 1737, "Hanmer . . . has done great things in this Author [Shakespeare]" (Smith, *op. cit.*, lvii). Bunbury suggests that he may have begun it as early as 1733, immediately after the publication of Theobald's *Shakespeare* ("Memoir," 81).

<sup>7</sup> Introduction to *Some Remarks*, v.

<sup>8</sup> Smith, *op. cit.*, 86.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 73, 74, 84, 85.

Contrary to what we might in logic expect if Hanmer had written the *Remarks*, there are important differences between the text of Hanmer's edition and parallel passages quoted by 'Anonymous.' For instance, where Hanmer has, "That he might not let e'en the winds of Heav'n,"<sup>10</sup> 'Anonymous' follows Theobald exactly in writing, "That he would not let e'en the winds of Heav'n."<sup>11</sup> Again, where Hanmer's editions reads,

A little month!—or e'er those shoes were old  
With which she follow'd my poor father's body  
Like Niobe, all tears—Why she, Ev'n she,—  
Oh Heav'n! a beast that wants discourse of reason  
Would have mourn'd longer—married with mine uncle,

the essay gives,

A little Month; e'er yet those Shoes were old  
With which she follow'd my poor Father's Body,  
Like Niobe, all Tears; Why she, even she,  
(Oh Heav'n, a Beast that wants Discourse of Reason,  
Would have mourn'd longer) married with mine Uncle,

The only actual change in wording here is "e'er yet" for "or e'er" (*even* for *ev'n* is a matter of spelling only), but the styles are different. The employment of a quite different system of punctuation, including parentheses and a liberal sprinkling of capitals, contributes to the impression that these two passages were not edited by the same hand. Indeed, there are altogether in the complete soliloquy (the longest single passage 'Anonymous' quotes) *no less than seventy-five variations* from the text as printed by Hanmer. Hanmer, we may well believe, would have better agreed with himself.<sup>12</sup>

A comparison of prose styles further weakens the assumption of Hanmer's authorship of the essay. The rhythm and tone are not

<sup>10</sup> VII, 329.

<sup>11</sup> *Some Remarks*, 19.

<sup>12</sup> It is true that 'Anonymous' is not consistent in his readings. In general he follows Theobald, whose text he constantly has before him for page number and other reference, but he does not stick closely to his original. His punctuation and spelling at times vary from Theobald's, and in at least one case he seems to be quoting, erroneously, from memory, when, unlike Pope, Theobald, and Hanmer, he omits 'flat' from the line "How weary, stale, flat and unprofitable." This very indication of carelessness however, is further evidence against Hanmer's authorship of the essay. Hanmer was assuredly not a careless editor.

his: he is habitually more dignified and restrained than the anonymous author; there is an academic formality in his manner, a slow movement of his sentences lengthening into rounded periods. He speaks of himself with exaggerated formality in the third person, as "One of the great Admirers of this incomparable Author" and "The promoter of the present Edition"; he uses the already archaic "hath" in the third person singular. This is in the Preface to his Shakespeare, but even in his letters his manner is much the same. The anonymous author writes in an informal, quick-moving style, not unlike the familiar manner of Addison. He speaks of himself in the first person: "I am going to do what to some may appear extravagant." "It does, I own, at first seem hard to be accounted for, but I think these reasons may be given for it." His sentences are often short, or if long, are uninvolved, simple, clear. His style is relaxed by many "very's," "so's," and "surely's." He writes "he has," never "he hath."<sup>13</sup> In general, the easy, near conversational style of the essay is so unlike the pedantic formality of Hanmer's Preface as to compel assent to Professor Lounsbury's judgment that Hanmer's authorship of the Remarks "is so improbable that it may be called impossible."<sup>14</sup>

Who then wrote the essay? I regret my inability to make a safe conjecture. Certainly it was not Warburton, who seems to have been considered.<sup>15</sup> I have followed a dozen leads pointing toward possible authors, including William Smith,<sup>16</sup> the translator of

<sup>13</sup> Even in such matters as capitalizing nouns, 'Anonymous,' who, like Theobald, quite consistently follows the early eighteenth century mode, differs from Hanmer. Hanmer capitalizes only important, 'Anonymous' practically all, nouns. Further, 'Anonymous,' also like Theobald, frequently uses 'd for *ed* as in *pleas'd*, *work'd*, *observ'd*; Hanmer retains the *e*.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, 60.

<sup>15</sup> The Bodleian copy of the *Remarks* bears on its fly-leaf a note to the effect that the authorship of this essay has been ascribed to Warburton. But the writer of the note dismisses the suggestion with a curt but effective argument, based on the fact that Warburton and the author disagreed on Shakespeare's intent in the lines in *Hamlet* spoken by the strolling player. Dr. Warburton thought they were meant as sublime poetry, the author of this essay as burlesque. Further decisive evidence lies in the deference to Addison in the *Remarks*. Warburton's remarks on Addison in his Preface and the well-established tradition of his dislike make it improbable that he would have paid the author of the *Spectator* any such compliment.

<sup>16</sup> Smith's translation of Longinus was made in 1739, three years after

Longinus, and Theobald himself, only to end with insufficient or contradictory evidence. It has not, however, been my purpose to name a substitute candidate, but rather to show the undoubted falsity of the whole tradition of Hanmer's authorship.

CLARENCE D. THORPE

*University of Michigan*

---

### AN ELIZABETHAN BALLAD OF MALMEROPHUS AND SILLERA

The fragments collected by Francis Douce and by him given to the Bodleian Library contain part of an interesting Elizabethan ballad, dated 1582, that seems to have escaped notice.<sup>1</sup> So early a specimen deserves at least a passing word. It was, according to custom, printed in two columns on a broadside, but only about a third—the bottom of the sheet—remains. Fortunately the colophon is preserved intact: "LONDON/ Imprinted by Iohn Wolfe, for Edwarde White: And are to be/ *solde at his Shoppe, at the little North doore of Paules Church,/ at the Signe of the Gunne. 1582./*"

The first column runs thus:

Triumphantlie by worthie Peeres,  
whose famous deedes were knowen.  
Amids which troupe was chose, *Malmerophus* the faire:  
Which sighte to see, braue beauties Nymphes,  
like Angels did prepare.  
But one among the crewe,  
was *Sillera* vnkinde:  
Whom to requite with seure doome,  
the Gods a way did finde.  
So he who scorned loue,  
had like for like ordaind:

---

the publication of the essay on *Hamlet*. He prefaced his translation with an interesting "Life and Writings of Longinus," and appended liberal notes. He professed discontent with modern critics and critical methods, praised Addison as belonging to the Longinus tradition, and was in general an advocate of a sympathetic criticism interested in beauties rather than faults.

<sup>1</sup> It is, however, listed in A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave's *A Short-title Catalogue of Books*, 1926, No. 17212.

The Knightes on Steedes, with staffe in hande,  
 to Iuste and sporte attaind.  
 O cruell fate, and cursed state:  
 Preparde, fast snarde,  
 For such a scornfull mate.

The second column reads:

Her Sampler [was a]bout her cast:  
 She hied, [t]ime spied,  
 To weare her sorrowes past.  
 Vpon a greene willowe, there hanged this Ladie:  
 A Tragicall ending, beleue me as may be.  
*Malmerophus* missing the sight of his Louer,  
 went wandring hether and thether:  
 And thought if he met her, with faire words to proue her,  
 he did so, they met both together:  
 With sprite all appalled, and colour cleane changed,  
 he cut down his Lady in vayn:  
 And found in the Sampler, the words which she fayned,  
 that bread this great dolour and payn.  
 He<sup>2</sup> made no more to doo:  
 But there he ended too.  
 Her Sampler off he tooke:  
 and so his life forsooke.

From these few lines the story does not clearly emerge, but it can be found in *A little Treatise called the Image of Idlenesse, containing certaine matters mooued betweene Walter Wedlock, and Bawdin Bachelor/ translated out of the Troyan or Cornish tung into English/ by Oliuer Oldwanton/ and dedicated to the Lady Lust. Newly corrected and augmented, 1574*,<sup>3</sup> whence the anonymous ballad-writer perhaps got his information about the luckless lovers.

[B8] There was also not long agone in *Ge-* [B8v] *noa*, bothe a knight and a Lady, who for the excellencie of their persons and qualities, were of such fortune, that diuers sued vnto them for loue, and could by no meanes obtain. For not regarding faithful hart and good minde, they coueted so much high Parentage & great abilitie that they thought none of their suters worthie to be accepted. The Knights name was *Malmerophus*, and the

<sup>2</sup> The original has printer's leads showing in place of the *e*.

<sup>3</sup> William Seres, its publisher, originally issued the book in 1558, entering it at Stationers' Hall early in that year as "*the Image of idelnes*." The passage I quote from the 1574 edition has no verbal differences from that in the 1558 edition, where it appears on sigs. C1v-C2.

Ladies *Sillera*, who at length by th'appointment of *Venus* fel both into loue and wer amorous eche of other. Then either of them called to remembraunce how many Suters they had suffred to perish by their obstinacie in loue before time. And therevpon fell into dispaire by remorse of conscience, thincking verily that in so much as they had so misused *Venus* lawes, *Venus* (from whom al grace to obtain in looue dooth proceed) would graunt them none, although it were required and deuoutlie praied for. In somuch that the one of them neuer durst motion the other of looue, alwaies tormented them selues with inward desire and desperate thoughts, till at length this Lady *Sillera* in folowing the feminine nature, which of necessitie, must by some meanes disclose their secret thoughts, [C1] wrought all her minde and oppinion with Silk in her Sampler, and soon after died only of looue longing, where of when *Malmerophus* had knowledge, and wist of her sampler as enraged for sorow, he strangled him self therwith and so miserably ended. Thus for lack of audacitie to disclose their mindes eche to other (which grace for their stubborne boldnesse in refusing of true loouers before time, *Venus* withheld from them) they died all bothe at mischeef, whiche if it be wel noted, is a great ensample for other to eschew like offence in auoiding the like or wurse punishment.

HYDER E. ROLLINS

*Harvard University*

### WHO WAS "THE LATE ARRIAN"?

When Thomas Kyd was arrested on a charge of sedition in the spring of 1593 his study was searched and a document, then called atheistical but really a defense of Unitarian principles, was discovered and put in evidence. Kyd, on being charged with atheism also and put to the torture, declared the document to be Marlowe's and to have been shuffled together with his own papers on occasion of their writing together in the same chamber some two years previous, and went on to fasten the charge of atheism on Marlowe so thoroughly that a warrant was issued for his arrest.

Thus much, as a result of the labors of a score of historians, is common knowledge, but there still remain a few words to say about this remarkable document itself,<sup>1</sup> irrespective of its consequences in the lives of two prominent literary men of the period. And indeed it has long been the subject of much learned con-  
 jec-

<sup>1</sup> It is preserved in Har. MSS and has been printed by F. S. Boas, *Works of Kyd*, Introduction, pp. cx-cxiii; S. A. Tannenbaum, *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, pp. 103-104; and W. D. Briggs, "On a Document Concerning Christopher Marlowe," *SP.*, xx (1923), 153-59.

ture. For years it was regarded as the work of the Cambridge Fellow Francis Kett,<sup>2</sup> apparently for no reason whatever except that he was a prominent Unitarian of the period who might have known Marlowe at Cambridge or in London. Consequently it was a very real contribution that Mr. W. D. Briggs made to the subject some ten years ago when he showed that the paper had been written, not by Kett, but by someone under arrest for Unitarianism in the year 1549. Mr. Briggs discovered that the book of a certain John Proctor, *The Fal of the Late Arrian*, published in 1549, had been devoted entirely to a refutation of the very paper found in Kyd's study. A copy of it had come to Proctor's hand, and following a favorite polemical device of the day, he had divided it into its main contentions and devoted a chapter to the refutation of each. When the quoted material at the beginning of his chapters is put together it is found to correspond exactly with the Kyd paper, although by some means the paragraphs or sections in Kyd's copy had been incorrectly arranged.

Proctor, however, for reasons of his own, chose not to reveal the name of the man whose opinions he was refuting. In his preface he says:

I intitule my treactise: The fall of the late Arrian: not disclosynge hys name throughe oute my worke, but under the name of Arrian: whom I wold be lothe to displease, if he hath Recanted that blasphemous opinion, as some saye that he hath. This oure late Arrian therefore not long synce was before certen of the Counsell & dyuers other Learned men, for his opinion, by whose procurement I know not. And deliuered the same his opinion with prouffes in writyng to the lord Archbishop of Caunterbury beyng therunto at length required, as in the begynnyng of his writyng he confesseth.

And Briggs, in spite of the valuable service he has performed by removing the name of Francis Kett from the discussion and showing that the document had been in existence since 1549, confesses that he is unable to penetrate behind Proctor's concealments and tell us who the author really was. At the end of his study he says:

<sup>2</sup> A. B. Grosart, *Life and Works of Greene*, I, 259, and Boas, *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. lxx. Kett seems not to have become infected with Unitarianism until his return, in 1585, to his home in Norwich, at that time a center of the Arian heresy, where he was burned by the Bishop of the Diocese in 1589. There is not a scrap of evidence to connect him with Marlowe either at Cambridge or in London.

The resources at my disposal have not enabled me to identify the original author of the document. The printed records of the Privy Council for the few years previous to the publication of Proctor's book furnish a list of numerous persons who were called before that body and rebuked or otherwise punished for holding heretical doctrines . . . but I have seen no reference to any examination conducted by his Grace of Canterbury.<sup>3</sup>

Had Briggs looked into John Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*<sup>4</sup> he would have found that the Archbishop conducted an examination of at least three persons charged with Arianism during the year 1549,<sup>5</sup> and that these were Michael Thombe, Joan Bocher or Joan of Kent, and John Assheton. Michael Thombe, a tradesman of London, although denying the Trinity, was accused mainly of disbelieving in the efficacy of infant baptism. He confessed and recanted. Joan of Kent, the most famous one of the group, was a simple peasant maid who maintained her heresy and was burned at the stake by Cranmer's order. John Assheton, a parish priest, maintained his position sturdily for a while and set forth his opinions in writing, but finally by some means he was prevailed on to recant. Strype says that the tenor of the abjuration he made was as follows:

I, John Assheton, priest, of my pure heart, free-will, voluntary and sincere knowledge, confess and openly recognise, that in times past I thought, believed, said, held, and *presumptuously affirmed by subscription of my proper handwriting*,<sup>6</sup> these errors, heresies, and damnable opinions following; that is to say, 1. That the Trinity of Persons was established by the Confession of Athanasius, declared by a psalm, *quinque vult*, &c.; and that the Holy Ghost is not God, but only a certain power of the Father. 2. That Jesus Christ, that was conceived of the Virgin Mary, was a holy prophet, and especially beloved of God the Father; but that He was not the true and living God; forasmuch as He was seen, and lived, hungered, and thirsted. 3. That this only is the fruit of Jesus Christ's passion; that whereas we were strangers from God, and had no knowledge of His testament, it pleased God by Christ to bring us to the acknowledging of His holy power by the testament.<sup>7</sup>

In view of what has been said it seems likely that this John Assheton was the original author of the document found in Kyd's

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

<sup>4</sup> London, 1693.

<sup>5</sup> There are not likely to have been more, for Strype declares that he has been through the great folio *Cranmer Register* page by page.

<sup>6</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>7</sup> I, 258.



study. He was the only person under arrest for Unitarianism in 1549 who is known to have written anything. Assheton recanted, and Proctor says he has heard that his opponent has recanted. Assheton was arrested December 28, 1548, and no doubt the trial was still in progress while Proctor was writing his book. This would account for his not having definite information on the subject. Furthermore, the tenor of Assheton's confession, as reported by Strype, corresponds in the main, and sometimes verbally, to the document Proctor was refuting. Finally, Assheton was a priest, and Proctor treats his adversary as one worthy of some reverence, concealing his name and being loath to displease him if he has recanted.

GEORGE T. BUCKLEY

*Blue Mountain College*

---

### THE PEJORATIVE USE OF *METAPHYSICAL*

The pejorative use of *metaphysical* (or *metaphysics*) by both prose-writers and poets in the seventeenth century and later was common enough to affect our interpretation of the term as employed by Dryden and Johnson. They probably were acquainted with its pejorative sense<sup>1</sup> and therefore thought it doubly applicable to a species of poetry of which they did not approve. They did not intend the word as a slur; they did, however, share the general neo-classical distrust of abstract metaphysical notions, particularly when woven into love poetry. I think that the consciousness of the pejorative sense made both Dryden and Johnson choose *metaphysical* as an especially descriptive and fitting adjective.

Most commonly the term was used in seventeenth-century poetry

<sup>1</sup> That Johnson was has been claimed by Nethercot in his *Abraham Cowley* (Oxford, 1931), 281 ff., where he cites two eighteenth-century examples of the pejorative use, one in Chesterfield's *Letters* and the other in Warton's *Essay on Pope*. But according to Nethercot the disparagement was limited to style: "In other words, 'metaphysical' has become connected with certain qualities of manner or style. . . ." (282); and Johnson "confused" this use, suggesting stylistic disparagement, and Dryden's. But there was no confusion; neither was *metaphysical* limited to style when used pejoratively. As seventeenth-century usage proves, it also referred to extravagant thought.

simply to mean above the material world, supersensible, and hence above "nature" (in the limited sense). John Tatham, Samuel Austin, and Thomas Shipman provide examples of this ordinary use.<sup>2</sup> But, although Austin tends in that direction, they do not use the term as an adjective descriptive of poetry.

The Italian poet Testi employed *metaphysical* ("concetti metafisici ed ideali")<sup>3</sup> in connection with poetry, and Drummond of Hawthornden also used the term ("metaphysical ideas and scholastical quiddities"),<sup>4</sup> possibly even earlier than Testi. Both expressed disapproval of metaphysics in poetry; and in their distaste is seen the beginning of the pejorative sense. Later this was increased by Bishop Maxwell<sup>5</sup> and Dr. Whichcote.<sup>6</sup> It is not surprising that churchmen should have used the word unfavorably; the more sober ones among the liberal theologians as well as the spokesmen for the Established Church recognized a dangerous enemy in the unchecked metaphysical speculation of many sects.

<sup>2</sup> Tatham, *The Fancies Theater*, 1640, "Clarinda describ'd":

Her ex'lence Metaphysicall,  
Partakes not of old Natures stamps. . . .

Austin, *Naps upon Parnassus*, 1658, "Upon Mr. John Cleaveland—":

Call him th'*Muses Metaphysick Reader*,  
Of all the Poets *Troup* stile him the *Leader*;  
Who with rare Novelties baffles the Sense  
Of the busie pated *Weeks* intelligence. . . .

(Here, as in Shipman's lines, there may be a pejorative tinge in *Metaphysick*; but I do not feel certain of it.)

Shipman, *Carolina: or, Loyal Poems*, 1683, "Wit and Nature," 180:

For *Metaphysick Notions* I lay by,  
Their subtleties for me too high.

<sup>3</sup> In his preface to a volume of poetry issued at Modena, 1627. Professor Grierson cites the passage in his edition of Donne's *Poems* (Oxford, 1912), II, 1.

<sup>4</sup> In a letter, written before 1641, to Dr. Arthur Johnston, physician and Latinist.

<sup>5</sup> *The Burthen of Issachar*, 1646, 31: "I confesse, this Divinitie is so transcendent and metaphysicall, that it exceeds my capacitie." (Quoted in *NED*, *metaphysical* I-b: "Applied with more or less of reproach to reasoning, ideas, etc. which are considered oversubtle, or too abstract").

<sup>6</sup> *Select Sermons* (Edin., 1742), 67: "Now since this Scripture, and other Scriptures, use no other Arguments to prove there is a God—therefore I shall forbear all other Reasons: For tho' I might produce many *metaphysical* Things; yet, because they are abstract from Sense, they shall not be nam'd."

It is interesting that at about the same time John Cleveland<sup>7</sup> used the term with an equally slight, but perceptible, suggestion of disparagement. It had yet, however, to receive a strong pejorative infusion. This happened in a few years: if to Bishop Maxwell, Whichcote, and Cleveland *metaphysical* meant abstract from sense, therefore difficult and dangerous, to "G. I.," Samuel Butler, and Abercrombie<sup>8</sup> it meant nonsensical. This use, conveying considerable ridicule, was well established before 1693, when Dryden published his *Discourse Concerning Satire*.

Both Dryden and Dr. Johnson were, I believe, aware of this pejorative sense and took advantage of it, thereby suggesting to their readers not only that Donne, Cowley, and the rest were thoughtful, speculative, and abstract, but that they dealt in notions which, to a neo-classical mind, were incomprehensible, vague, and repugnant to common sense. *Metaphysical* was more active in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than it is now; it was very much alive and correspondingly suggestive.

ROBERT LATHROP SHARP

*Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute*

---

<sup>7</sup> "The Hecatombe to his Mistress" (Saintsbury, *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, Oxford, 1905-1921, III, 21 ff.), 81-3:

Call her the Metaphysics of her sex,  
And say she tortures wits as quartans vex  
Physicians. . . .

<sup>8</sup> In *Naps upon Parnassus* "G. I." says of Austin (whom the volume made fun of):

Such *Metaphysicks* Thou writ'st as transcends  
Our low, if not thine own *Intelligence*.

Butler, *Hudibras*, Pt. I (1663), Canto I, 149-50:

He knew *what's what*, and that's as high  
As *Metaphysick* wit can fly.

Abercrombie, *A Discourse of Wit*, 1685, 103: "I conceive none to be such [a great wit], who has received but one Talent, though in just measure—I do far less judge those to be great Wits, who understand nothing, but what is beyond common Sense and Understanding, as these *Metaphysical Whimsies*, abstracted *Idea's*, and *Airy Notions*, that fill the empty heads of some speculative *Virtuoso's*."

## MILTON, IBN EZRA, AND WOLLEBIUS

In *Milton's Rabbinical Readings*,<sup>1</sup> Professor H. F. Fletcher finds echoed in the *De Doctrina Christiana*<sup>2</sup> the principles of Biblical exegesis present in Ibn Ezra's introduction to his commentary on the Pentateuch. In these matters, however, Milton's immediate source seems rather to have been the *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* of Joannes Wollebius,<sup>3</sup> which Milton knew thoroughly and used freely in the *De Doctrina*.<sup>4</sup> The passages from Milton's treatise, quoted by Fletcher, and the corresponding remarks of Wollebius are as follows.

*De Doctrina*, pp. 346-47

Sensus cujusque scripturae unicus est; in veteri tamen testamento saepe est compositus ex historia et typo: exempli gratia in his Hoseae verbis, cap. xi. 1. cum Matt. ii. 15. *ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum*: ubi et de populo Israelitico et de Christo puero sensus duplex constare potest.

Ratio recte interpretandi scripturas utilius quidem a theologis traditur, quam diligentius aut fidelius observatur; linguarum peritia; fontium inspectio; scopi animadversio; locutionis propriae et figuratae distinctio; causarum, circumstantiarum, antecedentium, consequentium consideratio; locorum cum aliis locis comparatio; fidei quoque ana-

Wollebius, p. 9

Sensus cujusque Scripturae non nisi unicus est: in Veteris tamen Testamenti Vaticiniis saepe est compositus ex historia & typo. Exempli gratia, Hoseae cap. 11. v. 1 in his verbis, *Quia puer Israelis est, & diligo eum; ideo ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum*, sensus est compositus; literaliter enim ac historice de liberatione populi Israelitici ex Aegypto; typice vero seu mystice de vocatione Christi ex Aegypto sunt intelligenda. Matthaei 2. 15.

Media verum Scripturae sensum investigandi sunt, frequens oratio; linguarum cognitio; fontium inspectio; argumenti & scopi consideratio; verborum propriorum & figuratorum distinctio; causarum, circumstantiarum, antecedentium & consequentium notatio ac Logica analysis, obscuriorum cum illustrioribus, similium cum similibus, dis-

<sup>1</sup> Urbana, Ill., 1930, pp. 61-62.

<sup>2</sup> Cantabrigiae, 1825.

<sup>3</sup> Oxoniae, 1657.

<sup>4</sup> William Godwin, *Lives of Edward and John Phillips*, London, 1815, p. 364; Charles R. Sumner, *The Prose Works of John Milton* (Bohn Edition), London, 1873, v, 66-67; A. D. Barber, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, xvi (1859), 596-97.

*De Doctrina*, pp. 346-47

Wollebius, p. 9

logia ubique spectanda est; syn- similium cum dissimilibus com-  
 taxeos denique haud raro anomalia paratio; fidei denique analogia.  
 non ommittenda. . . .

MAURICE KELLEY

*Princeton University*

## SOME EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SONNETS

Because of the paucity between 1740 and 1760 of Spenserian sonnets<sup>1</sup> and of sonnets dealing with love,<sup>2</sup> the following anonymous piece may be worth recording. It occurs in *The Magazine of Magazines, Compiled from Original Pieces, with Extracts from the most celebrated Books and Periodical Compositions Published in Europe* for March 1751 (II, 193). Sir Lionel Landmark, one of several gentlemen who meet to discuss politics and literature and thereby provide the staple of the magazine, describes a love-affair of his youth in the course of which he penned the following sonnet "To the all-beautiful Charlotte Somerville":

Whenas I view'd with ravish'd wonderment,  
 Earth's every beauty and each landskip gay;  
 To heav'n my adoration I up-sent,  
 And deem'd nought here cou'd beauteous be as they:  
 But when my eyes up to the heav'ns did stray,  
 And view'd all glorious walking thro' the sky  
 The gorgeous sun, my wonder flew that way,  
 Compar'd with that great sight all glories die:  
 For what (methought) with it cou'd dare to vie?  
 Ah me, I had not then, fair maid, beheld  
 Thy blooming cheeks and either sparkling eye,  
 Those worthier wonder than earth's gayest field:  
 These lovelier than each light that rolls on high,  
 Who views new lives, and yet who views must die.

There is no sign of indebtedness to Thomas Edwards' four Spenserian sonnets which appeared in the second volume (1748) of "Dodsley's Miscellany." Although the repetition of the *c* rhyme in the concluding couplet is irregular, and although no individual

<sup>1</sup> See R. D. Havens, *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1922, pp. 492-96 and 523-24; and A. D. McKillop, "Some Details of the Sonnet Revival," *MLN.*, xxxix (1924), 438-40.

<sup>2</sup> See Havens, p. 520, n. 2.

sonnet in the *Amoretti* is patently its source, the poem is of distinctly Spenserian cast.

Interest in the *Amoretti* is manifested likewise in George Pooke's *An Epithalamium, on the Most Sacred Marriage, of King George the Third, to Princess Charlotte* (London, 1763). The "Introductory Preface," written in 1762, expresses great admiration for Spenser, and not simply for the *Faerie Queene*:

about seven or eight years ago I begun (in imitation of the same Author) an Epithalamium on my own Marriage. . . . About the same time, and since, of beginning my Epithalamium, I likewise wrote several Sonnets agreeable to it, in the direct stile and manner of Spenser's *Amoretti*, and which as soon as possible, I will intirely finish.<sup>3</sup>

In the 1783 edition of Pearch's *Collection* (III, 298-300) were printed two Spenserian sonnets by Bishop Percy: "Occasioned by Leaving B—X—N, July 1755" and "To a Lady of Indiscreet Virtue." They had appeared, the former attributed to "J— C—" and latter to "T— P—," in the 1770 edition (III, 281, 289-90). Their previous publication in Lloyd's *St. James's Magazine* for 1764 and, still earlier, in the *Universal Visiter and Memorialist* for 1756 has been pointed out by Miss Rinaker and Dr. Alan D. McKillop, respectively.<sup>4</sup> Even more popular than this evidence suggests, they were twice printed (over the initial "P.") in *The Grand Magazine of Universal Intelligence*, in 1758 (I, 145) and in 1760 (III, 611), and the second appeared under the title "A Sonnet After the Manner of Spenser: To a young Lady" (attributed to "J— Spr—g C—" <sup>5</sup>) in *The Town and Country Magazine* for 1782 (xiv, 160). There are minor differences in the texts of these versions: for example the place-name in the title of the first sonnet is given in *The Grand Magazine* version as "B—R—T—N." <sup>6</sup>

By 1789 the eighteenth-century sonnet was so firmly established that it provoked two curious burlesques. One is a "Pugilistical Sonnet On viewing the Stage erected for Johnson and Perrins, at

<sup>3</sup> Pp. viii-ix.

<sup>4</sup> "Percy as a Sonneteer," *MLN.*, xxxv (1920), 56-58; "Some Details of the Sonnet Revival," *MLN.*, xxxix (1924), 439.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the attribution of the other poem to "J— C—" in Pearch, 1770 ed.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. "Bath" in the *Universal Visiter*, "B—R—N" in Pearch, 1770 ed., and "B—X—N" in Pearch, 1783 ed.

Banbury. Supposed to be written by an Amateur.”<sup>7</sup> The other, by Henry Lemoine, is entitled “Slang Sonnet, Education”<sup>8</sup>:

A Link-boy once, *Dick Hellfinch*, stood the grin,  
 At Charing-cross he long his bawling plied;  
 “Here light, here light, your honour for a win,”  
 To ev’ry cull and drab he loudly cried.  
 In Leicester Fields, as most his story know,  
 “Come black your worship for a single \*mag;”  
 And while he shin’d, his *Nelly* sack’d the †bag,  
 And thus they sometimes stagg’d a precious ‡go.  
 In Smithfield too, where graziers oft resort,  
 Dick loiter’d there to take in men of cash,  
 With cards and dice was up to ev’ry sport,  
 And at Salt Petre Bank would cut a dash;  
 At ev’ry knowing rig in ev’ry gang,  
*Dick Hellfinch* was the pink of all the slang.  
 \*Halfpenny. †Pocket. ‡Good booty.

ROBERT A. AUBIN

*Harvard University*

## JAMES ROBERTSON, POET AND PLAYWRIGHT

James Robertson, who is not mentioned in the *DNB*., was a bad poet, a bad dramatist, and a doubtless mediocre actor-manager, connected with the Theatre Royal at York, and with other theatres in the North. He contributed frequently to the literary journals in the 1770’s, and his collected poems, now almost never seen, went into at least four editions. The first of these was *Poems, consisting of Tales, Fables, Epigrams, By Nobody*, 1770. The next was called *Poems on Several Occasions. By J. Robertson*, 1773. The “second” edition of the latter, with alterations and additions, was entitled *Poems, consisting of Tales, Fables, Elegiac and Miscellaneous Pieces, Prologues, Epilogues*, 1780. The “third” edition, with the same title as the preceding, but with new alterations and additions, was published in 1787. *A Collection of Comic Songs, written, Compil’d, Etch’d and Engrav’d, by J. Robertson; And Sung by him At The Theatres Nottingham, Derby, Stamford, Hali-*

<sup>7</sup> *The General Magazine and Impartial Review*, III, 458.

<sup>8</sup> *The Town and Country Magazine*, XXI, 571. Incidentally, on page 330 there is “A Gothic Sonnet.”

*fax*, *Chesterfield*, and *Redford*, appeared without date (probably in the '70's). The book contains colored<sup>1</sup> engravings, with music, for each song. Another collection of *Comic Songs*, also undated, with the same title, but a slightly different list of booksellers, has entirely different contents. One of the last two volumes has a preface signed "J. Robertson, Manager (with Mr. Adcock) of the Theatres Nottingham, Derby, Stamford, Halifax, Chesterfield & Redford." Robertson's anonymous play, *The Heroine of Love, A Musical Piece of Three Acts*, was published at York in 1788.

Out of *The Ladies' Own Memorandum Book for 1769*, published by T. Slack, the Newcastle printer, is extracted for the *Newcastle Chronicle* of Nov. 19, 1768, "The Bear and The Gardener. A Fable," signed with Robertson's initials. The fable appears again in the *Poems by Nobody*. Robertson probably contributed to the same newspaper "To Delia, at S——h" (Sept. 29, 1770); "Marriage: A Song" (Nov. 9, 1771); "A Fable" (Sept. 18, 1773); "The Wit and The Sage. A Fable" (Jan. 7, 1775); and "A Song" (Dec. 30, 1775). His poetical essays in *The Gentleman's Magazine* are as follows: "A Tale, From the Erse of Dermot O'Monaghan, a Religious of the Order founded by St. Ignatius" (March 1776, pp. 134-5); "The Toasts. A Fable" (May 1776, pp. 229-30); "Temperance" (Oct. 1776, pp. 474-5); "Miss Crambo, A Fable" (Dec. 1776, p. 571); "On hearing the Rev. Mr. A——n declare from the Pulpit, 'That were it not for Fear of Hell Men would be as wicked as the Devils Themselves'" (Dec. 1776, p. 572); "The Influenza, a Tale" (April 1777, pp. 187-8); "The New-Born, a Tale" (May 1777, pp. 238-9); "The Quack, a Tale" (June 1779, p. 319). All these pieces are signed with one or both of Robertson's initials, and most are in the third edition of his *Poems*.

The first of these contributions to *The Gentleman's Magazine*, the "Tale from the Erse," etc., had appeared in *Poems*, 1773, as "The Ghosts," and was published separately in 1786, as "Saint Peter's Lodge: A Serio-comi-legendary Tale," with a dedication to George, Prince of Wales. The textual changes were merely verbal; but it is curious that the title-page attributes it to "the Author of the Register-Office,"—that is, Joseph Reed, the rope-

<sup>1</sup> It is proper to add that the British Museum copy is the only one I have seen.



making playwright who wrote that ill-starred tragedy, *Dido*, of which Dr. Johnson said, "Sir, I never did the man an injury; yet he would read his tragedy to me." How to adjudicate the claims of these two authors, both "J. R.," to the same poem, I do not know. It was certainly not a poem worth stealing. And in general, it may be said of all Robertson's work that, though it occasionally displays vivacity, its merit as poetry is invisible.

BERTRAND H. BRONSON

*Berkeley, California*

---

### A NEW LETTER FROM CHARLES LAMB

In 1908 the Melbourne Public Library purchased a number of papers from Miss Lydia Johns, evidently the daughter or granddaughter of the Reverend J. Johns of Liverpool, in whose house Hazlitt's sister Margaret passed the last years of her life. Among these papers is the following previously unpublished letter from Lamb to Mrs. Hazlitt which is published here by permission of Messrs. J. M. Dent & Sons:

[no address or date]

Dear Mrs Hazlitt,

I am so very nervous and miserable that I cannot ask you here. I have suffered so much from all day & all night long company, with which I have been harassed, and which is new to us since being here, and am so incapable of the sort of life, that I wish I had done anything than come here. It is from no unkindness to you, but I apply it to every London friend I have, and heartily pray that they would leave me alone. It is a disease, but I cannot help it, the same in a less degree (*sic*) that drove me for weeks into a state of utter sleeplessness a year or to [two] since & I must break thro all ceremonies & all friendships too rather than incur the danger I was then in. I am sorry to seem unkind to William, whom I like better than any youth of his age, but I cannot invite him to come when he pleases, in my present state. It vexes me to be so unfriendly, but I am very poorly & tis necessity

Yours, very miserable

C L

[addressed]

Mrs Hazlitt

10 Buckingham Street  
Strand

[postmarked] JU. 29 1829

The "state of utter sleeplessness a year or two since" is obviously

that referred to by Lamb in his letter to Allsop on January 9, 1828, but, for the rest, the new letter is rather difficult to fit into the other correspondence of Lamb at this time. He speaks as if his sister were with him, but he was alone from the end of May until the end of September 1829, and on July 25 he wrote to Bernard Barton: "I have had the loneliest time near 10 weeks, broken by a short apparition of Emma for her holydays, whose departure only deepened the returning solitude, and by 10 days I have past in 'Town.'" The letter seems to bear some relationship to the one to the younger William Hazlitt, dated by W. C. Hazlitt June or July 1833,<sup>1</sup> but correctly assigned by Mr. E. V. Lucas to this period. In this letter Lamb says,

I am very uncomfortable, and when Emma leaves me, I shall wish to be quite alone, therefore pray tell your Mother I regret that I cannot see her here this time, but hope to see her when times are better with me. The young ladies are very pleasant, but my spirits have much ado to keep pace with theirs.

Emma Isola adds a letter, in which she says: "I am sorry your mother will not be able to visit Enfield [Edmonton];<sup>2</sup> but indeed Mr. L's spirits are very bad, or I am sure he would have been happy." The fact that this letter was addressed to "Mr. Wm. Hazlitt, *Junr.*" at "36 Southampton Buildings, Holborn, or at the Southampton Arms" proves that it was written while his father was still alive, for Southampton Buildings had been Hazlitt's address at various times ever since 1807 (no. 34 for many years, and no. 9 at the time of the *Liber Amoris* episode), and Patmore describes "three or four evenings that I remember to have spent with Hazlitt and Hone in the dingy wainscoted coffee-room of the Southampton Arms in Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane"<sup>3</sup> about this time. Indeed, it is obvious that the letter to young Hazlitt was written before June 10, 1829, by which date the departure of Emma and her friend had left Lamb alone once more.<sup>4</sup>

It is clear, however, that the new letter cannot refer to the

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Charles Lamb* (Bohn's Standard Library), II, 408-9.

<sup>2</sup> Edmonton is evidently W. C. Hazlitt's attempt to correct what would have been a slip had his dating of the letter been correct. Actually, of course, it helps to prove him wrong.

<sup>3</sup> Cited by P. P. Howe, *Life of William Hazlitt*, p. 418.

<sup>4</sup> E. V. Lucas, *Works of Charles and Mary Lamb*, VII, 827.

requests from Mrs. Hazlitt and the young William for permission to visit which were refused in the earlier letter. Apparently they were renewed some weeks later, only to be refused again; and, however difficult it is to reconcile Lamb's statement about being harassed by "all day and all night long company" with the picture of his loneliness which he draws for Bernard Barton, it is quite clear that he did *not* wish to see Mrs. Hazlitt.

R. C. BALD

*University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia*

### BALZAC IN ENGLAND

In enumerating the translations and plagiarisms of Balzac's works which appeared in England between 1833 and 1836, Marcel Moraud mentions, in *Le Romantisme français en Angleterre de 1815 à 1848* (Paris: Champion, 1933), a partial translation of *Maître Cornélius* which appeared in the *Dublin University Magazine*;<sup>1</sup> an anonymous partial translation of *Le Père Goriot*, in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*; <sup>2</sup> and another anonymous translation or adaptation of *Gobseck*, in *Chamber's Edinburgh Review*.<sup>3</sup> To these items might have been added at least three other anonymous translations of Balzac, which are noted here as a minor contribution to the study of Balzac's literary fortunes in England.

"Le Dragon Rouge," which appeared in the *Dublin University Magazine* <sup>4</sup> over the signature J. C., is in reality an adaptation and partial translation of *Jésus-Christ en Flandre*, which was first published in Balzac's *Romans et contes philosophiques* (Paris: Gosselin, 1831). The title was taken from the name of the "galley" which, in the English version, was said to ply between

<sup>1</sup> "Maître Cornelius (sic); From the French of M. de Balzac," III (February and March, 1834), 129-48; 265-84. Moraud (*op. cit.*, p. 382) gives the date as 1833.

<sup>2</sup> "Le Père Goriot; A True Parisian Tale of the Year 1830," XXXVII (February, 1833), 348-53.

<sup>3</sup> "The Parisian Money-lender; A Tale," V (February 27, 1836), 35-36.

<sup>4</sup> II (October, 1833), 386-90. It seems likely that the title used by the magazine was suggested by *L'Auberge rouge*, which appeared in the same volume of *Nouveaux contes philosophiques* (Paris: Gosselin, 1832) with *Maître Cornélius*.

Dover and the Continent "in the days of old, when Edward Longshanks ruled this realm," instead of between Ostend and Cadzant "à une époque assez indéterminée de l'histoire brabançonne," as Balzac relates. That the English translator wished to conceal the extent of his indebtedness to the original is apparent not only in his rearrangement of the opening paragraphs of the tale, which he rewrites completely, but also in his changes of names. Balzac's unnamed *patron* becomes the Schipper (sic) Gilles Vandergueht, "a surly Fleming"; Thomas, the old mariner, becomes Master Gaspard; while la dame de Rupelmonde becomes the Countess d'Estottville, a name undoubtedly borrowed from Georges d'Estouteville who appears in *Maître Cornélius*. The care with which the translator eliminates the romantic and, in this case, supernatural elements of the tale, and, on the other hand, preserves the vigorous character delineation and realistic detail of the original, gives a striking demonstration, in a single instance, of the contemporary British attitude toward the two tendencies of Balzac's work in general. In *Jésus-Christ en Flandre* the bark sinks in the storm, but at the divine Stranger's exhortation: "Ceux qui ont la foi seront sauvés en me suivant!" the young mother and her child, the soldier, the old woman, the two peasants, and even doubting Thomas, the old mariner, follow their Saviour over the waves to safety. In the translation

The stranger was aware that the land could not be far off. 'Well,' said he, as he sprung from the vessel's side, 'I shall at least escape the clumsy grasp of that thick-skulled Fleming, if he should happen to sink.'

The four sailors were the only persons on board who had resolution enough to follow his example.

The ship itself is saved for, as the master of Le Dragon Rouge explains to the stranger, encountered on the beach the next morning, "when you and those other heavy lubbers leaped over board, the tide floated her in like a cork."

Balzac's *L'Auberge rouge* proved useful to the *Dublin University Magazine* in two ways: in suggesting a title for the adapted *Jésus-Christ en Flandre*, and in furnishing the major portion of "The Red Inn at Andernach; A Tale Within a Tale,"<sup>5</sup> which appeared without name of author or translator. Here again the intention to disguise the piracy is rendered the more obvious by

<sup>5</sup> III (June, 1834), 632-46; IV (July, 1834), 79-91.

the means adopted to conceal it. The title is expanded; the chapter divisions are changed and the titles omitted; quotations from Juvenal, Shakespeare, and Wilson are used as epigraphs for the two installments; and lastly, an entirely new introductory section, dealing with London in June, 1830, is substituted for Balzac's "Introduction." Once the actual narrative gets under way, the English version follows the original text somewhat more closely than in the case of *Jésus-Christ en Flandre*, although it leaves much to be desired as a translation.

The first English translation of *Le Colonel Chabert* appeared in the *Metropolitan Magazine* of May and June, 1833, under the title "The Count Chabert,"<sup>6</sup> without name of author or translator. The mendacious "Prefatory Notice" added to conceal the source and authorship of the tale, and perhaps also to flatter the gallophobia of the *Metropolitan's* readers, is in fact a high tribute to Balzac's realism:

The story of Count Chabert (which has recently been dramatized<sup>7</sup> in France) is one of those frightful truths which, to paraphrase an expression of our Gallic brethren, "merits to be fictive"; and not, as it unhappily is, a narrative of events that happened in our times. The writer of this brief notice has often been in company with M. and Madame de Ferraud, the latter of whom always made a disagreeable impression upon him—a clever and rather pert woman, whose dashing manner did not always veil her native vulgarity. . . .

Both M. and Madame de Ferraud are now dead; and if Colonel Chabert still exist, it is in the state described at the conclusion of this recital.

"The Count Chabert" follows the original text<sup>8</sup> much more closely than do the partial translations and adaptations mentioned above. As a translation, however, it is stiff, inaccurate and often

<sup>6</sup> VII, 102-12, 208-22. The *Metropolitan Magazine* (London, 1831-57), a popular miscellany devoted to light fiction, was edited from 1832-35 by Captain Frederick Marryat, assisted by Edward Howard. See Walter Graham's *English Literary Periodicals* (New York, 1930), pp. 289-90.

<sup>7</sup> Jacques Arago and Louis Lurine, *Chabert; histoire contemporaine en deux actes, mêlée de chant* (Paris: J. N. Barba, 1832), presented at the Théâtre du Vaudeville, Paris, July 2, 1832.

<sup>8</sup> The title, as well as the addition of a fifth but unnumbered chapter heading, "Conclusion" (not noted by Spoelberch de Lovenjoul), which appears only in this, the second French version, indicates that the text translated was that which was published in the first volume of *Le Salmigondis* (Paris: Fournier, 1832).

quite incorrect. As Moraud says of the anonymous translator of *Gobseck*, the translator of *Chabert*

évite constamment les outrances de ce réalisme qui l'attire, les fantaisies de cette imagination trop exubérante de Balzac, les trouvailles tantôt bizarres, parfois triviales, ou même saugrenues, qu'un public anglais eût mal supportées.

The "complete list" of translations of Balzac's works appearing in America between 1828 and 1885 given by Benjamin Griffith in his *Balzac aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Les Presses Modernes, 1931) dates the first American translation of *Le Colonel Chabert* "circa 1843."<sup>9</sup> As a matter of fact, the first appearance of *Chabert* in America was in the May and June numbers, 1833, of the *Metropolitan Magazine*,<sup>10</sup> which was republished from the London periodical in New Haven, Conn., by Peck and Newton. It may be objected that the appearance of this earlier American version is perhaps more a matter of bibliographical interest than of literary significance, as the translation was published without Balzac's name, and as it was chosen neither by an American editor or translator, nor for an American public, the *Metropolitan* being merely a republication of the English miscellany of the same name. Nevertheless, in view of the unscrupulous custom of preying upon foreign publications during the period in question it would be surprising if a careful examination of other American periodicals did not uncover many more plagiarisms and imitations of Balzac, taken from both French and English sources, than are included in Griffith's bibliography.

THOMAS R. PALFREY

Northwestern University

#### BALZAC'S FIRST THOUGHT OF CÉSAR BIROTTEAU

M. Maurice Serval, in his very informative article, *Autour de Balzac. César Birotteau*,<sup>1</sup> dealing with the history, sources and

<sup>9</sup> *The Lady With Two Husbands* (New York: J. Winchester, n. d. [c. 1843]). In "French Novels," v. Translated from *La Comtesse à deux maris*, which appeared in *Scènes de la vie parisienne*, iv (Paris, 1835).

<sup>10</sup> "The Count Chabert," pp. 194-98, 233-40. The *Metropolitan Magazine* was republished in New Haven from 1831-35, and in New York, with the sub-title "American Edition," from 1836-42.

<sup>1</sup> *RHL*, xxxvii (1930), 196-226, 368-392.

social background of Balzac's study in bankruptcy, finds it impossible to discover any traces of a plan for *César Birotteau* in its author's mind before 1833, though he admits the possibility of an interest in the subject by Balzac at an earlier date.<sup>2</sup> There is, however, one indication which the French author has apparently failed to notice, pointing rather plainly to a preoccupation on Balzac's part with at least one detail of *César Birotteau* as early as 1830. This is found in a letter from Dr. Jean-Baptiste Nacquart to the author of the *Comédie humaine*, dated at Paris November 23 of that year.<sup>3</sup> In it, the learned French physician, an intimate friend of Balzac, gives requested information concerning proper methods of treatment for the skin. The letter begins as follows:

Vous me demandez des renseignements sur les agens auxquels on accorde la propriété de conserver la peau lorsqu'elle n'a point encore subi d'atteintes, ou de corriger ces mêmes impressions quand l'âge, des circonstances accidentales ou morbides l'ont altérée. Question grave et en présence de laquelle la science hippocratique et l'art du parfumeur émettent des doctrines assez opposées. Les concilierons nous, vous et moi, par notre intervention?

Then follows a detailed account of various ways of lubricating the human epidermis; and in the body of this communication reference is made to Balzac's interest in the question from the literary point of view:

Abordons le travail du rhabilleur, si toutefois votre courage, moitié médical, moitié littéraire, veut aller au delà.

And the obliging physician draws his letter toward a close thus:

Pardon, mon cher et spirituel ami, de ce long, lent et tardif bavardage, mais j'ai voulu vous donner des matériaux.

Now, the only section in any of Balzac's works dealing with the treatment of the skin is in *César Birotteau*, the prospectus of César's *Pâte des Sultanes et Eau Carminative*,<sup>4</sup> in which an attrac-

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 377. In this connection, I desire to express thanks for expert advice on the dating of letters in the *Correspondance générale* of Balzac to Dr. A. G. Canfield of the University of Michigan, who aided me in this study.

<sup>3</sup> Letter 2 in *Correspondance inédite de Balzac avec le Docteur Nacquart*, Cahiers balzaciens, Paris, Aux Editions Lapina, 1928.

<sup>4</sup> Professor Chinard has pointed out to me that, as *eau carminative* is a kind of *eau purgative*, a *parfumeur* was legally forbidden to sell it, even

tive description is given of the wonders wrought by the *parfumeur's* lotion on every type and condition of the epidermis. It is plain, then, that sometime before November 23, 1830, Balzac had written to Dr. Nacquart for scientific information concerning skin-culture and that the physician's letter represents a reply to those queries. It will be remembered that in the novel *César* similarly obtained aid from a kindly chemist, of whom he asked "les moyens de composer un double cosmétique qui produisît des effets appropriés aux diverses natures de l'épiderme."<sup>5</sup>

Again, since the success of the *Pâte des Sultanes* et *Eau Carminative* was destined to be a stepping stone in César's rise to a position of prominence in the commercial world, Balzac must already have had in mind the *grandeur*, if not the *décadence*, of his hero, that is, an important element in the plot of *César Birotteau*, at the date of his letter to Dr. Nacquart.

It cannot be said, however, that the good doctor's information was utilized to any considerable extent in the actual composition of César's prospectus. Balzac had doubtless consulted his physician friend for the purpose of giving himself a basis of scientific fact on which to build and as a protection against the commission of too gross errors on his own part, but with no illusions as to the applicability of much that Dr. Nacquart would say to the commercial charlatanism of a César Birotteau; so none of the physician's prescriptions for treatment appeared in the novel, and only one statement concerning skin disorders, and that in a single line, found analogies in the ingratiating prose of the prospectus. Dr. Nacquart said:

Enfin votre poupée est sujette à des boutons, à des rougeurs! Mêlez un peu d'extrait de Saturne . . . etc.

And César enlarged upon the subject thus:

Cette précieuse Pâte, qui exhale les plus doux parfums, fait donc disparaître les taches de rousseur les plus rebelles. . . . L'Eau Carminative enlève ces légers boutons qui, dans certains moments, surviennent inopinément aux femmes, et contrarient leurs projets pour le bal.<sup>6</sup>

though the material mentioned in his prospectus was intended for purely external application. There seems to be no evidence that Balzac was conscious of this little error in his use of names.

<sup>5</sup> *César Birotteau*, Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1878, p. 31.

<sup>6</sup> *César Birotteau*, p. 33.



However, even there, Balzac may have drawn his ideas and diction from other sources, particularly the advertisements of lotions similar to that of César Birotteau, current in Paris at the time the novel was composed, and interestingly described by M. Serval.<sup>7</sup> The letter of Dr. Nacquart does throw light, however, on the manner in which the author of *César Birotteau* used the knowledge of friends in the service of his art.

G. M. FESS

*University of Missouri*

---

### A LETTER FROM LAMARTINE TO "GR. K."

We know that in his last years Lamartine struggled against ill-health and financial worries. By 1859 he was in debt to the extent of four million francs and unable to liquidate his assets which were largely in the form of real estate. In vain did he seek to sell this property in order to pay his creditors. It was too late to regret his lavish expenditures, his extravagant generosity, his huge land investments. The only possible way to save himself from complete bankruptcy seemed to lie in selling his beloved châteaux, Milly, Saint-Point, and Monceaux. During this period of anguish and physical suffering he wrote numerous letters<sup>1</sup> to friends in the vain hope that they might proffer financial help. He indicated that France owed him a great deal for his political services and that she had failed to show her gratitude. Among these sad letters is one which has long been treasured by my family and which, I believe, has never before been published. It is in answer to a letter of sympathy written to the poet by a native of Geneva, George Kaufmann, who married Julie Juvet, my great-aunt. I publish Kaufmann's letter in order that Lamartine's may be more intelligible. In reproducing the latter, I have respected the poet's spelling and his indifference to accents and apostrophes.<sup>2</sup> Lamartine's letter is dated by himself and endorsed with the same date in another hand.

<sup>7</sup> *Autour de Balzac. César Birotteau*, pp. 369, 370.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. those published in the *Revue de Paris*, 1 mai 1934, pp. 73-4.

<sup>2</sup> Acknowledgment should be made to Professor Albert E. Trombly of the University of Missouri for his generous help in deciphering Lamartine's hand. The originals of the letters here reproduced are now in the University of Missouri library at Columbia, Missouri.

Genève 11<sup>e</sup> 9bre 1859

Monsieur, (mon cœur dit: cher Monsieur!)

Permettez à un admirateur obscur, mais sincère, du beau don que Dieu vous a fait, de venir apporter, s'il est possible, une parole de sympathie à vos souffrances morales et physiques, et puisse-t-elle, vous faire du bien, au degré de l'ardent désir qu'en éprouve mon cœur!

J'ai lu avec une douloureuse tristesse dans un Journal de notre ville, votre courte réponse à *Mr. Jules Forest de Lyon*, et ces mots: 'Je suis très-malade et je touche au naufrage complet! . . .', ont eu, venant de votre plume, un retentissement déchirant dans mon âme.

O mon Dieu! m'écriai-je, non; tu ne permettras pas 'un naufrage complet!'

S'il n'atteint que le fragile esquif, l'enveloppe terrestre de cette créature que tu as si magnifiquement douée pour te célébrer, hélas! dur le lot que nous a légué à tous, la première désobéissance; mais 'un naufrage complet!' oh! non, Seigneur mon Dieu! ne le permets pas!

Rappelle à celui qui souffre aussi cruellement que *tu l'as aimé le premier*; que pour lui tu n'as pas épargné ton propre Fils, ton unique, mais l'as livré à la mort ignominieuse de la croix! Rappelle-lui que tu lui demandes de croire ainsi à ton amour parfait, révélé en Jésus-christ, sans autre condition antérieure, et ce 'naufrage,' comme la douloureuse tristesse appelle un délogement, ce naufrage n'en sera jamais un, mais au contraire, une arrivée joyeuse au port éternel du salut et de la félicité!

Je demande au Seigneur que cette main qui a pu écrire: 'L'homme est un dieu tombé, qui se souvient des cieux,' que cette main s'élève avec foi, avec amour et adoration, vers Celui qui n'exige que la foi à Sa miséricorde et à Son amour manifestés en Jésus, pour recevoir l'homme tombé là où il n'y a ni larmes, ni deuil, ni souffrances!

C'est donc à l'Amour qui prévient avec tendresse le pécheur, que mon cœur vous remet, en terminant ces lignes, que je n'ai pu résister à vous écrire, soit qu'elles vous parviennent ou qu'il n'en soit rien!

Je demeure, Monsieur, si j'ose dire, avec affection profondément sympathique

Votre respectueux  
Gr. K.

Monsieur

A: de Lamartine  
(Saône & Loire) à *Mâcon*

Monsieur

Excusez un malade de n'avoir pas souvent la plume à la main. Mon cœur aurait porté à vous répondre plus tôt mes souffrances et mes affaires mont retardé.

Sachez seulement que j'ai vivement ressenti ce bon procédé de votre cœur et que votre nom sera inscrit parmi mes consolations.

La France à laquelle j'ai tout sacrifié laisse périr mes braves créanciers avec moi; pour moi je me résigne, pour eux je proteste. 2' ou 300 000 les

aurait sauvés; jamais je ne pardonnerai à mon pays de s'être vengé de moi en les comprenant dans ma réprobation.

Recevez Monsieur l'assurance des sentiments que votre lettre m'inspirent.

Envoyez moi non des Anges mais des acquérreurs de mes biens, ils seront les anges de mes créanciers.

Lamartine

au château de Monceau pres Mâcon

18 nov 1859

SIBLEY MERTON

Columbia, Missouri

### HUMANISME, HUMANITISME, AND HUMANITARISME

By 1765, interest in philanthropic enterprises in France had reached such proportions that one of the economists affiliated with this movement, the Abbé Baudeau, saw the need of a new word to denote the sentiment known in English as humanitarianism. In December of that year, Baudeau founded a weekly journal, the *Ephémérides du citoyen ou Chronique de l'esprit national*, which later became, under the editorship of Du Pont de Nemours, the chief organ of the physiocrats. It was in the first volume (issue of Dec. 27, 1765) that Baudeau defined

cette vertu qui n'a point de nom parmi nous (l'amour générale de l'humanité) que nous oserions appeller *humanisme*,<sup>1</sup> puis qu'enfin il est tems de créer un mot pour une chose si belle, si nécessaire, et qui devrait être si commune.<sup>2</sup>

The word was used again in the second number of Volume II (Jan. 6, 1766, p. 29): "C'est ainsi que dans les grandes ames, l'*humanisme* regle toujours les desseins même de la politique et du patriotisme."

Curiously enough, Baudeau suddenly changed the word, speaking in Volume V (Aug. 15, 1766, p. 206) of "cette vertu que nous avons osé nommer l'*Humanitisme* ou l'estime et l'amour général de l'humanité." In Volume VI (Sept. 15, 1766, p. 65) we read of "le plus précieux des sentimens, l'*humanitisme*, pere de la liberté

<sup>1</sup> There is no record of the word *humanisme*, in the cultural sense, earlier than the 19th century.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 246-247. Baudeau's neologism is mentioned in G. Schelle, *Du Pont de Nemours et l'école physiocratique*, Paris, 1888, p. 100.

légitime et du vrai bonheur," and again in Volume VII (Sept. 22, 1766, p. 98) :

Votre Philosophie vous apprend donc à sacrifier les sentiments patriotiques à ceux de cette vertu . . . que vous nommez l'*humanitisme*, exprimant ainsi, par un mot nouveau, des sentiments qui ne sont pas plus communs que cette expression si récente.

While this change may have been due to faulty memory, it seems more likely that Baudeau attempted to improve his original word. Perhaps he realized that *humanisme* might be erroneously associated with the well-known word *humaniste*, whereas *humanitisme* was more akin to *humanité*. Whatever the reason, his second word fared little better than his first, and probably never passed beyond the pages of the *Ephémérides*. The idea of humanitarianism continued to be expressed by a locution, usually with the word *humanité*.<sup>3</sup>

The word *humanitarisme*, of more recent date, seems to have originated with a pejorative meaning. Armand Weil<sup>4</sup> traces the word back to 1838, when Balzac wrote in *Les Employés* :

Son cœur s'enflait de ce stupide amour collectif qu'il faut nommer l'*humanitarisme*, fils aîné de défunte philanthropie, et qui est à la divine charité catholique ce que le système est à l'art, le raisonnement substitué à l'œuvre.<sup>5</sup>

If Balzac coined this word, as the quotation suggests, he may have been influenced by the word *humanitaire*, which was used in 1833 by Michel Raymond: "L'humanitaire est le radical par excellence. Petites ou grandes, à ses yeux, toutes les réformes se tiennent."<sup>6</sup> According to Bloch,<sup>7</sup> Alfred de Musset used the word *humanitaire* in 1838.

<sup>3</sup> For the use of this word in France in the 18th and 19th centuries, see Eduard von Jan, "'Humanité,'" *ZFSL*, LV (1932), 23-58.

<sup>4</sup> "En marge d'un nouveau dictionnaire [by Oscar Bloch]," *Revue de philologie française*, XLV (1933), 24.

<sup>5</sup> *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Michel Lévy frères, Paris, 1870, XI, 154-155.

<sup>6</sup> Lorédan Larchey, *Dictionnaire historique d'argot*, Paris, 1878, pp. 206-207, noted by Weil, *loc. cit.* The *NED*. gives no examples of *humanitarianism* and *humanitarian*, in the sense we are concerned with, prior to 1850 and 1844, respectively, although the former is found in 1833 and the latter in 1819, with different meanings.

<sup>7</sup> Oscar Bloch, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française*, Paris, 1932, I, 371.

Although Littré, in 1863, defines *humanitarisme* simply as a neologism meaning "système, doctrine humanitaire," the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* retains the pejorative sense of "amour de l'humanité excessif et prétentieux" in admitting it, for the first time, in the latest edition (Fascicule iv, 1931).

EDWARD D. SEEBER

Cleveland, Ohio

### FERWAZZOT

Die in der Handschrift Cod. Carlsruhe LXXXIII befindliche Glosse *ferwazzot* wurde von Graff (1, 1089), Mone (*Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit*, Bd. 4, S. 88, 87) und Steinmeyer (*Ahd. Gl.* 1, 761, 64 falsch gelesen. Sie hielten offenbar *ferwazzot* für eine Übersetzung des unmittelbar darunter stehenden Wortes *maranatha*. Dies ist aber nicht richtig, denn *maranatha* ist ein hebräisches Wort mit der Bedeutung "der Herr kommt" und hat garnichts mit *ferwazzot* zu tun: dies ist vielmehr eine Verdeutschung der links daneben stehenden lateinischen Glossen *perditio & detestatio*, die über *sit anathema* geschrieben wurden. Der Schreiber hat ohne Zweifel den Satz im Text richtig verstanden, denn er fügt am Rande auch noch die lateinische Glosse hinzu: *condemnatus sit donec dominus redeat*, eine korrekte Übersetzung der ganzen Phrase: *sit anathema maranatha*. Dass er das Wort *maranatha* als hebräisch verstanden hat, hat er ausserdem durch die Randbemerkung ". . heb. zu erkennen gegeben.

E. A. POLLARD

University of Oregon

### RECENT WORKS ON PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1800

Laurie Magnus' *History of European Literature* (Norton), which is being highly praised, may be an admirable outline of poetry, drama, and non-fictitious prose; but it treats with disproportionate brevity the prose fiction of Boccaccio, Rabelais, Cervantes, Rousseau, and Goethe, says nothing about Apuleius and Petronius, and proceeds upon the old-fashioned assumption that the developments in that genre are negligible. Generally speaking,

research in the history of prose fiction is still the step-child of literary scholarship. Such progress as seems perceptible is, as heretofore,<sup>1</sup> haphazard and disorganized. Some of the new studies are avowedly contributions to the history of the genre; but much of the new information appears incidentally, not to say accidentally, in books and articles which are preoccupied with other matters and whose authors often seem unaware that they are bringing forth something of interest to the student of the "forgotten genre." The difficulty of giving even a slight degree of coherence to a survey of such heterogeneous writings will, I trust, be appreciated. I am here concerned with the significance of the new works from only a single point of view; and my praise or dispraise of any of them should not be interpreted as an affirmation or denial of their value in other respects.

MEDIEVAL. What is likely to prove one of the foundation-stones for the future history of prose fiction is being laboriously quarried by Mr. and Mrs. H. M. Chadwick of the University of Cambridge. Their *Growth of Literature*, to be completed in three volumes (Cambr. U. P.) pays especial attention to "literature that is independent of written transmission," and in its first volume presents valuable descriptions and comparisons of "prose story" or "saga." In some of the literature examined, notably in the Irish, prose was a more important form than verse. The Chadwicks make a sharp distinction, which may prove impracticable, between narratives written for entertainment and narratives written for didactic purposes; but one must await the completion of their labors before estimating its general significance.—The second volume of Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (Ind. U.), deals mainly with magical themes.

The Chadwicks give due attention to the Icelandic sagas; and the most imaginative form of these, the *Lygisögur*, is the theme of Margaret Schlauch's *Romance in Iceland* (Amer. Scan. Found.). Based upon an examination of the Mss in Reykjavik and Copenhagen, and written in a clear and lively style, this is the first monograph in English upon the important developments in this type, especially between 1200-1500. The materials are surveyed topically, under such headings as "The Setting," "The Old Gods and Heroes," "The Classical Tradition," "The Road to the East," and "Recurrent Literary Themes." The addition of an introductory chapter giving a description of the chief works in chronological

<sup>1</sup> See my previous surveys: *MLN.*, XLII (1928), 121; XLIII (1930), 416; XLVI (1931), 95; XLVIII (1933), 370.

order would render this book even more valuable. Ralph Allen's *Old Icelandic Sources in the English Novel* (U. of Penn.) deals mostly with nineteenth-century novels, but students of the earlier periods will find in it a useful account of the beginnings of English interest in the sagas and a chronological table of early translations and studies.

G. R. Owst's *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* is a good example of the typical medievalist's indifference towards prose fiction as such. It has a chapter on the exempla, and shows an unrivalled familiarity with those found in Mss in English cathedral and university libraries. It provides a valuable list of contemporaneous quotations proving the importance of exempla (pp. 152-4); and it sets forth their characteristics,—their love for the marvelous, and their anticipations of the renaissance fondness for realism, social satire, and frivolity. Here and there one may pick up useful details, such as the account of the development of the myth of the Daughters of the Devil (pp. 93-97), or of the legend of Thomas of Canterbury (pp. 126-34). In an excursus which no student of Bunyan should overlook, Dr. Owst suggests that some of the traditional materials in the *Pilgrim's Progress* may have reached Bunyan through seventeenth-century preachers who were carrying on the traditions of the medieval pulpit. Usually, however, Dr. Owst is not interested in such topics, and adheres to the common assumption that literature primarily means drama and poetry. He says next to nothing about the narrative technique of the exempla, or of the relative merits of their chief authors (no advance beyond Mosher and Welter in these respects). He devotes much space to the influence of the exempla upon miracle and morality plays and upon Langland's verse. But if one turns to his otherwise valuable volume for an answer to such questions as: "What incidents, characters, and points of view were derived from the exempla by the writers of the sixteenth-century popular tales, or by such authors as Deloney?" one is left unanswered. Among the chief composers of fiction in the Middle Ages were the makers of saints' legends and exempla; and until the bridge between them and the renaissance is thrown, we shall have no consecutive history of the genre.

Herbert Thurston, S. J., in "St. Mary Magdalen—Fact and Legend" (*Studies* [Dublin], xxiii, 110) analyzes "the preposterous legends of her apostolate in Provence." Irene P. McKeehan, in "The Book of the Nativity of St. Cuthbert" (*PMLA.*, xlviii, 981) shows the interrelations between romances and legends. With ingenuity and thoroughness, Grant Loomis sets forth (*Harvard*

*Studies*, xiv, 83; xv, 1), the amazing elaboration of the story of St. Edmund. He also traces in "King Arthur and the Saints" (*Spec.*, viii, 428) fragments of Arthurian legend in various saints' lives. Katherine Garvin (*MLN.*, xlix, 88) shows that the story of the stubbornness of Noah's wife was current in the eleventh century. During the twelfth, as J. W. Spargo expounds in his handsome volume, *Virgil the Necromancer* (Harv. U. P.), the popular biographical romance about the Mantuan began its influential career. He follows its many versions down to the sixteenth-century *Virgilius*. H. M. Smyser discusses the influence of folk-lore upon the "Engulphed Lucerna" episode in the Pseudo-Turpin (*Harv. Stud.*, xv, 49); and D. D. Griffith maintains that the Griselda story originated in "the tabu group of Cupid and Psyche tales" (*Univ. of Wash. Publ. in Lang.*, viii, 1). J. A. MacCulloch, in *Medieval Faith and Fable* (Marshall Jones) does not deal with stories as such, but presents a rich ingathering of common themes and superstitions.

The Oxford University Press reprints, in appropriate and beautiful form, *Mandeville's Travels* from the edition of 1568, supplying the omitted pages from the Cotton MS. Arpad Steiner (*Spec.*, ix), presents a strong argument for assigning 1365-71 as the date of composition. The new evidence has a bearing upon the problem of the authorship. Jean d'Outremeuse, at present the favorite candidate, was born in 1338 and died in 1400.

The apparent contradiction between Malory the man and Malory the author is sharpened by the facts brought forth from the Record Office by A. C. Baugh in "Documenting Sir Thomas Malory" (*Spec.*, viii, 3). In a small limited edition of two volumes (the Widener Library has a copy) Basil Blackwell reprints from the unique copy in the Rylands Library the Wynkyn de Worde text of *Le Morte D'arthur* (1498) with the woodcuts. Nellie S. Aurner, explicitly disclaiming any intention of interpreting Malory's work as a *roman à clef*, plausibly points, in "Sir Thomas Malory—Historian?" (*PMLA.*, xlviii, 362), to characters and incidents which seem to reflect the author's own experiences. Eugène Vinaver is continuing the painstaking study of Malory's use of sources in "A Romance of Gaheret" and "The Legend of Wade" (*Medium Ævum*, i, 157; ii, 135), the former article ably supporting the likelihood that the Gareth story was derived from a lost Prose *Tristram*. One of M. Vinaver's disciples, Miss F. Whitehead, in "On Certain Episodes in the Fourth Book" (*Ibid.*, ii, 119), shows that Malory sometimes was unwilling to follow his sources when they accepted social customs and attitudes which were rightly



repellant to him. But the mystery how such a ruffian in conduct could be so knightly in sentiment still remains.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY. *Mary of Nimmegen* (c. 1518) has been reproduced in facsimile (Harv. U. P.) from the unique black-letter copy in the Huntington Library, with an introduction by H. M. Ayers and A. J. Barnouw. To make this tale accessible was to perform a real service to scholarship in prose fiction; for, with its curious combination of crudity and skill, it helps us to understand what was happening to the art of narration and characterization in the dusky period between Malory and the Elizabethans. But it must be confessed that for modern eyes black-letter is difficult, and that the intrinsic merits of the story would appear to better advantage in ordinary type. One of the desiderata in our field is a well-edited collection of the extant popular tales of this period, based upon the rare early editions, to replace the antiquated Thoms.

No one interested in the fiction of the period from Caxton to Pettie should fail to consult H. B. Lathrop's *Translations from the Classics: 1477-1620* (U. of Wisc.). Within its scope lie the *Prose Aesop*, *Metamorphoses*, and *Aeneid*, the classical tales in Painter and Pettie, and the Greek Romances. The author has made an independent and systematic comparison of all the English texts with the classical originals and the continental translations, and he has considered the significant changes which the translators made in the substance and the style. He presents the results of many years of research in a form which is characteristically modest, succinct, and reliable. When, for example, he has ascertained, after examining the Latin, French, and Italian versions, that an English translation was made directly from the Greek, he establishes that fact without any lengthy demonstration of the negative results. René Pruvost, independently of Lathrop, confirms (*Rev. Angl. Am.*, x, 481) the latter's assertion that Angel Day, for moral reasons, toned down the eroticism of *Daphnis and Chloe*.

It has been suspected that thorough research would disclose that Rabelais was better known in England than hitherto demonstrated. Huntington Brown's *Rabelais in English Literature* (Harv. U. P.) makes some additions to the previous knowledge about the subject; but these additions show Rabelais' influence upon lexicographers, dramatists, and essayists, rather than upon writers of prose fiction. Dr. Brown is non-committal with respect to Nash. As in his recent edition of Girault's *Tale of Gargantua* (Harv. U. P.), he insists that this pre-Rabelaisian folk-tale was so well known that it is rash to infer that allusions in Elizabethan authors to Gargantua, Grand-

gosier, etc., derive from Rabelais. He supports Salyer's findings as to the influence upon Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem*. To us the most important pages are those upon Swift, Smollett, and Sterne, which not only point out the many borrowings, but also the distinctions in purpose and tone between those humorists and the Father of Pantagruelism. He attributes the unexpectedly slight appreciation of the real Rabelais in England to the pervasive "non-conformist conscience."

So far as one can judge from the printed abstract (*Ohio State U. Abstracts*, x, 298) Victor Solberg's thesis, *A Source Book of English and American Utopias* deserves publication in full. It systematically analyzes twenty-eight Utopias, most of them of the nineteenth century, but including More's, Bacon's, Hartlib's, and Gott's. It differentiates the type from such kindred forms as the Robinsonade, idyllic romance, political treatise, religious treatise, etc., and by a process of comparison tries to determine what have proved to be the special values and limitations of the Utopias. Montgomery Carmichael (*Dubl. Rev.*, Oct., 1932) considers the significance of the fact that More chose for his ideal state a pagan rather than a Christian commonwealth.

W. G. Zeeveld (*MLN.*, XLVIII, 217) holds that Sidney in the first version of the *Arcadia* was making a veiled protest against the French marriage project; Constance M. Syford (*PMLA.*, XLIX, 472) finds the source of the Pamela-Cecropia episodes in Plutarch's *Moralia*; and Emile Legouis (*Rev. Angl. Am.*, x, 418) discusses the first French translator of an English literary work, Jean de Tourval, who translated Sidney. The reviews of Osborn's *Sidney en France* by H. C. Lancaster (*MLN.*, XLVIII, 269) and M. S. Goldman (*JEGP.*, XXXIII, 295) are rich in new information.

C. E. Saunders (*PMLA.*, XLVIII, 392) makes it clearer than ever that *Greene's Vision* and *Groatsworth of Wit* are not biography but prose fictions. D. T. Starnes (*SP.*, XXX, 455) discloses the sources of Barnabe Riche's *Sappho*. Charles J. Sisson, in *Thomas Lodge and Other Elizabethans* (Harv. U. P.), based upon hitherto unused public records, shows that the relations between the elder brother and the younger in *Rosalynde* "are almost ludicrously paralleled to those of William and Thomas Lodge." (Cf. J. W. Draper, "Orlando, the Younger Brother," *PQ.*, XIII, 72). Alice Walker (*RES.*, ix, 410) supplements Sisson's biographical investigations, the general result of which is to reveal Lodge as a prodigal who quarreled litigiously with his steady-going bourgeois family. A delightful, if perhaps too subjective, appreciation of Deloney is Llewelyn Powys' (*Virg. Quart.*, ix, 578) who characteristically praises him

as troubled with "no idealistic notions" but loving human life, the sun, and ginger-hot-i'-the-mouth.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. D. W. Thompson (*SP.*, xxx, 59) calls attention to Bacon's use in *The New Atlantis* of the experiences of William Adams, the first English resident in Japan. Kurt Sternberg follows his study of the Utopia (*Arch. für Rechts und Wirtschafts-Philosophie*, xxvi, xxvii) with one on the *City of the Sun* (*Hist. Zs.*, cxlviii, 520), in which from the point of view of political science, the sources and the ideas of Campanella are minutely analyzed. Similarly the historical and political theories of Harington's *Oceana* are examined by Richard Koebner (*Engl. Studien*, lxviii, 358). A greater interest in prose fiction as such is shown in R. N. Cunningham's good monograph, *Peter Anthony Motteux* (Blackwell). It describes Motteux' coarse but lively novelettes in the *Gentlemen's Journal*, his popular *Banquet for Gentlemen and Ladies*, and gives a thorough and judicious account of his important work as a translator of Rabelais and Cervantes. The late Mr. Whibley exalted Urquhart at the expense of Motteux,—but both Huntington Brown (*op. cit.*) and Cunningham rightly regard the Frenchman as almost his equal in style. A bibliography of Motteux by Cunningham is shortly to be published by the Oxford Bibliographical Society. Alpheus W. Smith furnishes an abstract of his "Collections and Notes of Prose Fiction in England: 1660-1714" (*Harv. U. Abst.*, 1932, 281).

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. Four dissertations, two German and two American, deal with closely related subjects, and display interesting differences in aims and methods. Johanna Birnbaum's *Die Memoirs um 1700: Eine Studie zur Entwicklung der realistischen Romankunst vor Richardson* (*Stud. zur Engl. Phil.*; Niemeyer, Halle) lists more than a hundred memoirs dating from 1671 to 1740, found in the British Museum and the Bodleian; classifies them as of the court, the nobility, the bourgeoisie, and adventure; and describes some outstanding examples in detail, such as Hamilton's *Grammont* and the anonymous *Memoirs of Love and Gallantry*. The author rightly insists that this type of fiction has been too much neglected by historians, and that it prepared the reading public for the advent of Richardson. She makes much of the fact that the Puritan bourgeois could quiet his conscience by accepting the pretense that the memoirs were true history, while at the same time indulging in the forbidden delights of imaginative and impassioned narrative. She points out that many situations and devices found in the memoirs appear in Richardson's novels. She

regards her study as supplementing Schöffers' *Protestantismus und Literatur* and Danielowski's *Journale der Quaker* (both in the same series); but her knowledge of other studies in the field, including my *Mary Carleton Narratives* and the monographs on Defoe, is much too limited; and consequently, though her statements of fact are of value, her generalizations rest upon too narrow grounds.

Frank G. Black's *Technique of Letter-Fiction in English from 1740 to 1800* (*Harv. Stud.*, xv, 291), based upon Professor Greenough's extensive bibliographical collection, and upon examination of letter-novels in several large libraries, is a severely condensed report, showing that out of about 3,000 novels published during the period, at least 506 and probably many more were epistolary in form, the heights of their vogue being c. 1771 and c. 1788. Dr. Black classifies them into twelve subdivisions in a neat algebraic manner, and names the best known examples of each division. He cautiously analyzes the advantages, disadvantages, and essential methods, of the genre. He overlooks no feature perceptible to common sense, and ventures no statement that might be refutable. This is a typical product of the Greenough school of research,—incredibly diligent in accumulation, cannily keeping to verifiable facts and obvious inferences, and shrinking from anything as hazardous as literary appreciation or philosophic interpretation.

Much wider in scope, and less rigorous in method is Godfrey F. Singer's *The Epistolary Novel: Its Origin, Development, and Residuary Influence* (U. of Penn. P.). It ranges from antiquity to modern times. Its author, whose untimely death is deplorable, had gathered a large collection of letter-novels which have been given to the University of Pennsylvania Library; and his bibliography includes many rare examples. He includes consideration of Biblical and Ciceronian epistles, of Alciphron (the father of letter-fiction), of the model-letters of the sixteenth and later centuries, and finds in Nicholas Breton the man who vitalized the nascent genre. His outstanding figure, of course, is Richardson. Few will share his enthusiasm for Richardson as a moralist; but it must be acknowledged that his appreciation of the originality of Richardson's technique, is well justified. The greater or lesser skill of the other important eighteenth-century novelists is also shown, Smollett emerging very favorably from the test. Dr. Singer too often digresses from his special theme, and he harps needlessly upon the popularity of the letter-novel; but on the whole his work is a valuable one.

The most philosophical of these four dissertations is Hildegaard

Zeller's *Die Ich-Erzählung im Englischen Roman (Sprache und Kultur der Germ. und Rom. Völker*, xiv; Breslau). Its purpose is to examine the most important fictions written in the first person (novels in autobiographical or epistolary form), in order to ascertain what kinds of materials have proved most suitable for this method of narration, and what authors have been most successful in developing its inherent possibilities. Dr. Zeller, though appreciating the special advantages of the "I-form" over the "He-form," is not blind to its limitations, and believes that in those instances where it has been successfully employed certain conditions must have been met as to the novelist's relation to his plot and characters. She finds that the He-form, for reasons that she does not attempt to explain, was predominant until the eighteenth century, that the I-form was rather crudely used in the seventeenth century, and that Defoe and Swift employed it somewhat more skilfully but without fully realizing that it demands psychological kinship between the author and the supposed teller of the story. The full perception of the nature of the art was not attained before Richardson and Goldsmith; Sterne fell short of them because his teller does not narrate, but talks essays. In view of the amount of attention which writers upon the theory and technique of the novel are at present bestowing upon the so-called "withdrawal of the author from the scene," the timeliness of this thoughtful historical essay is obvious.

C. W. Webster points out some of the precursors and sources of *A Tale of a Tub* (*PMLA.*, XLVIII, 1141; *MLN.*, XLVIII, 251). M. M. Rossi and J. M. Hone's *Swift, or the Egoist* (Gollancz) is a piece of dogmatic impressionism, but Stephen Gwynn's *Life and Friendships of Dean Swift* (Holt) brings out points in *Gulliver's Travels* which are sometimes overlooked. The Oxford University Press provides in inexpensive form a complete unexpurgated edition of *Gulliver's Travels*, *A Tale of a Tub*, *The Battle of the Books*, etc. The introductions, by W. A. Eddy (though slightly negligent about acknowledging indebtedness to previous interpreters) are the best new criticisms; they set forth Swift's attitude and purpose in a thoroughly sound way, and should help to destroy current misconceptions.

P. B. Anderson (*PQ.*, XIII, 168; cf. *Harv. Abstr.*, 1932, 194) holds that Mrs. Manley deserves a better repute, because of her insight into character and the breadth of her interests. New facts, from the Public Record Office, about the troublous life of Defoe are given by J. R. Sutherland (*RES.*, ix, 275; *MLR.*, xxix, 137). W. H. Bonner (*RES.*, x, 320) stresses his interest in geographical

publications. H. H. Anderson (*U. of Chicago Abstr.*, 1934) is highly indignant over the inconsistency between Defoe's moral idealism and his support of aggressive commercialism. E. G. Fletcher (*N&Q.*, CLXIV, 4) compares University of Texas copies of *Robinson Crusoe* with Hutchins' descriptions; and J. R. Moore (*N&Q.*, CLXIV, 26, 249) suggests that some of its nomenclature derives from Dampier. C. E. Burch (*Engl. Stud.*, LXVII, 178; LXVIII, 410) traces the changes in Defoe's reputation from 1719 to 1894. Entertaining as well as useful is the collection of memoirs of Jack Shepherd in the Notable British Trials series (Hodge). A. W. Secord (*TLS.*, Apr. 19, 1934) provides the first dependable data about Alexander Smith's *Lives of the Highwaymen*.

P. B. Anderson (*MLN.*, XLIX, 178) detects Prevost borrowing from Otway's *Orphan*. A. D. McKillop's "English Circulating Libraries: 1725-50" (*Trans. Bibl. Soc.*) demonstrates the close connection between minor novelists, booksellers, and librarians. Elsewhere (*RES.*, IX, 67) he supplies from MS records of the Stationer's Company, the hitherto unknown facts about Richardson's early years as a printer. W. M. Sale (*Yale Univ. Libr. Gaz.*, VII, 80) relates Richardson's experiences with practical Dublin publishers. An ingenious essay in creative imagination is E. K. Broadus' "Mr. Richardson Arrives" (*Lond. Mercury*, XXVIII, 425). Charlotte Lefever (*PMLA.*, XLVIII, 856) suggests that Richardson's success was paradoxical because he intended to produce type-characters and model letters, but was sometimes carried out of himself into the creation of the individual and the unconventional.

B. Maelor Jones of the Middle Temple, in *Henry Fielding: Novelist and Magistrate* (Allen and Unwin), authoritatively enhances Fielding's reputation as a noble character and courageous reformer (Cf. letters by A. R. Leslie-Melville and Paul de Castro, *TLS.*, July 27, Aug. 10, 1934). W. J. T. Collins describes *The True Anti-Pamela*, by James Parry (*Monmouthshire Rev.*, I, 8). L. M. Knapp (*MLN.*, XLVIII, 246) produces some revealing letters by Smollett; and J. H. Birss (*N&Q.*, CLXIV, 315; CLXV, 189) presents more of his correspondence. Sterne emerges surprisingly well from a scrutiny of his record as a parish priest, made by S. L. Ollard (*TLS.*, May 25, June 1, 1933). The "points" of the first edition of *Tristram Shandy* are listed in *TLS.*, Feb. 22, and Apr. 12, 1934. J. R. Moore (*MP.*, XXXI, 79) contends that Paltock's *Peter Wilkins* furnished some details to *The Ancient Mariner*.

R. S. Crane (*MLN.*, XLVIII, 462) proves that Goldsmith was

termed "Dr." earlier in his career than has been supposed. Harold Stein (*MLN.*, XLIX, 171), dealing with the so-called Goldsmith's translation of the *Roman Comique*, furnishes an amusing illustration of the economy of effort bestowed by that author upon his hackwork. The beginnings of his popularity in France are traced, from the *Mercure*, by W. Roberts (*TLS.*, Nov. 30, Dec. 28, 1933). A fine analysis of his personality appears in *TLS.*, Mch. 1, 1934; and W. F. Gallaway (*PMLA.*, XLVIII, 1167) pleads that we should discriminate between his common sense, tempered with kindness, and the thoroughgoing sentimentalism of the Shaftesburian school.

A. A. Overman's *Investigation into the Character of Fanny Burney* (Amsterdam), based upon a new system of psychology, makes much of her alleged "infantilism," "father-fixation," etc., but does not contribute anything substantially new towards an understanding of her personality and work. The authorship of *The Sylph*, a popular novel admired by Miss Burney, is attributed by an anonymous scholar (*TLS.*, June 21, 1934) to Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire. G. L. Joughin's dissertation, *The Life and Work of Elizabeth Inchbald* (*Harv. U. Abstr.*, 1933), shows that the social theories of her *Nature and Art* were influenced by a temporary contact with Godwin's circle, and confirms the general judgment that *A Simple Story* is her most artistic work. The unpublished MS of this thesis includes an extensive bibliography of her works, a list of her reading, and a transcript of her essay on the art of the novel.

Margaret E. Macgregor's *Amelia Opie: Worldling and Friend* (*Smith Coll. Stud.*, xiv) is a good biography, thoroughly documented, of a notable personality. Miss Macgregor meant to include in it a critical study of Mrs. Opie's novels, but unfortunately her death intervened. She has, however, left us the essential foundations for such a study. Jane Austen's *Volume the First* (Clarendon Pr.), written in her 'teens, contains amusing parodies of the novels of the 1780's and 90's. This little volume is edited by R. W. Chapman with his usual expertness and good taste.

J. M. Stein (*SP.*, xxxi, 51) shows that Railo was mistaken in seeing genuinely Shaksperian influence in Walpole. The best that can be said for K. K. Mehrotra's *Horace Walpole and the English Novel: 1764-1820* (Blackwell) is that it is handsomely produced, and that it shows first-hand acquaintance with nearly 200 novels and their contemporary reviews. The attempt to isolate the specifically Walpolean current in the ocean of Gothic novels was timely and worthwhile; but to do so successfully, it would

obviously be necessary to define accurately the features peculiar to *Otranto*, and to know the studies of specialists in that field. In both requirements, Mr. Mehrotra fails. His diligence is wasted because of lack of scholarly method. He pleads that he had already written his book when Miss Tompkins' appeared (why not thereupon revise his own?); and, incredible as it may seem, he knew nothing of the studies of Foster on Prevost, of Brauchli on the "Castle novels," of Gerhard Buck on the Historical Novel, or of Heidler on the History of Criticism, each of which concerns a vital point in his dissertation. That such disregard of the basic principles of research should be permitted in a thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Letters, *Oxon.*, is disquieting.

Lois Whitney's *Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (Johns Hopkins Pr.) originated in "a casual reading" of Charlotte Smith's novels; and many of its pages deal with novelists,—Henry Brooke, Charlotte Lennox, Day, Holcroft, Bage, Melmouth, etc. It shows a wide knowledge of the scholarly investigations of scores of novelists (Gignilliat's *Day* being one of the very few studies that have been overlooked). It gives keen and dependable analyses of the novelists' views concerning the state of nature, the simple life, evolution, and the future of mankind. Not in reproach but in sorrow I must, however, add that this learned study has been seduced from the realm of the history of imaginative literature into that of the history of thought. It is a volume in the series, "Contributions to the History of Primitivism"; its foreword is by an eminent professor of the realistic school of philosophy; and it is dedicated to an equally eminent professor of literature who inclines to identify the history of literature with the history of ideas. Consistently therewith it weighs the novelists as thinkers, and finds them steeped in fallacies. Many of those poor wretches fancied that mankind had been happier in primitive times, and also that mankind would be happier in the future; but, from the viewpoint of realistic philosophy, they were therefore muddle-headed. The rationalistic historian of thought is bound by his axioms to scorn the faith that imagination has descried the truth about human destiny more truly than logic can do, that life is a paradox, and that art which portrays it paradoxically is truer than common sense; but this is the faith to which the greatest authors testify, and to which literary historians who understand them must adhere.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois



## REVIEWS

Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: *Huttens letzte Tage. An Historical-Critical Edition.* By ROBERT BRUCE ROULSTON. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. 238.

Ulrich von Hutten died when thirty-five years of age. Herman Hirt is quite right when he says (*Ges. d. d. Spr.*, 2nd ed., p. 180) that when a Swiss has difficulty in determining what language he shall employ it is not a question of choice between Hochdeutsch or Schwyzerdütsch but between Hochdeutsch and Französisch. No Swiss ever felt the strain imposed by this alternative more acutely than C. F. Meyer. The war of 1870-71 persuaded him to adopt German. His first major work in it was *Huttens letzte Tage*, with its scant 15,000 words, here edited in a volume 7½ x 9 inches, 238 pages, quite enough room in fact to contain the whole of Shakespeare, if published in brilliant or even diamond type. Heaven bless our university presses! Without them we would know no such spatial sumptuousness.

This is the most objective piece of scholarship that has ever come to the present writer's notice. *Huttens letzte Tage* is a precious and priceless German "Dichtung." It is also without a single exception the most difficult creation of its length to read with American students. It is based on history, bristles with veiled allusions, fetching subtleties, and poetic niceties. Yet of all this we have not a word. The editor staked off a gateless paddock and never once even so much as looked over the fence while doing his duty. For this we may well thank him; for his immediate task, which might have been done less expensively but could hardly have been done better, was in itself so important that had he branched out into the subjective realm of literary appreciation we might have suffered from a confusion of issues. On the contrary, Roulston assures us that he meant his edition to be merely the "foundation for all future studies of the work."

Here was the problem. On June 13, 1871, Meyer wrote "... und bringe mit Ihrer Erlaubniss den fertigen Hutten mit." In other words, the first edition, though it carries the date 1872, was finished in 1871. An eleventh edition appeared in 1897 or 1898, and a twelfth in 1899. But the tenth is regarded as the "Ausgabe letzter Hand," so that we have ten different editions of this work that show variants. All the editions were small, about 750 copies, some of them are to-day exceedingly rare, the proof-reading was none too good. Roulston has succeeded in procuring a copy of each edition, has reproduced here, in long primer type, on expansive pages, in

parallel columns that admit of effortless survey, the 10th (1896), 5th (1884), 3rd (1881), and 1st (1872) editions, each correctly proof-read, has given the actual variants of the remaining six editions, an uncommonly succinct account of their history (pp. ix-xv), the relevant references from Meyer's correspondence bearing on the work (pp. 220-236), and a series of sensible indices. It is an upstanding piece of work such as is done infrequently by American scholars; and it is more useful than showy.

Here is the point: No man who has ever written anything has failed to submit a manuscript to the United States Post Office without at once wishing he had it back in order to make some change. But in the average mortal's life that inept expression is like an elephant's tusk: once you get it out of your mouth you can't get it back in, for the proof returns to you in time with the editorial injunction to "make only necessary changes." Meyer was a poet; when he wanted to make a change, he did so through the medium of a new edition. Let us see, in just a few cases, how he grew stylistically, bearing in mind that a successful war made him a German poet. Would he have become a French poet had it not been for Sedan? Was he actually *deutschfest* when he wrote these earlier editions? For in his letters from this same period there is an abundance of French or near-French words that would set Eduard Engel to writing still another *Entwelschung* (new ed. 1918, 616 double-column pages).

In the writer's own desk copy (Leipzig: Haessel, 33rd ed., 1906) there are 8 main sections and 71 sub-sections, with a total of around 1000 couplets, or "stanzas" as Roulston rather loosely calls (p. ix) them. It is always most difficult to write the first few words. The opening couplet in the first edition (1872) runs as follows:

Wie nennst du, Schiffer, dort im Wellenblau  
Das Eiland?—"Herr, das ist die Ufenau!"

That is distinctly superior to the version of 1896 (10th ed.):

Schiffer! Wie nennst du dort im Wellenblau  
Das Eiland?—"Herr, es ist die Ufenau!"

This latter version lays too much stress on the skipper as contrasted with the island, the object in which Hutten was primarily interested. If Voltaire was right in contending that *L'adjectif est l'ennemi du substantif*, Meyer was given to shifting hostilities within his syntax without previous notice. Compare

Lass, Schriftgelehrter, deinen Styl mich schau'n!  
Er ist nicht glatt, nein ungehobelt, traun! (1872)

with

Der Styl ist gut! Der Styl verdient ein Lob!  
Glatt, elegant . . . Potz Blitz, da wirst du grob! (1884)

This latter entails difficulties. Visually, the rhyme is perfect; in

everyday speech it is not, and Meyer did not know much about the etymology of "grob" with the attendant peculiarity in its sound. Regardless of the lexicons, "grob" rhymes with "ob" as it comes from the lips of people.

What Meyer said (p. 224) in 1871 about "das neue Reich" has a peculiarly prophetic ring 63 years later and now. In 1881 he wrote under the noticeable caption "Deutsche Libertät"

Geduld! Wir stehen einst um Ein Panier  
Und wer uns scheiden will, den morden wir!

In the versions of 1884 and 1896, only one word is changed: For *Ein* read *ein*. Lasting lessons in the evolution of style, and a number of other issues more important because more *gegenwärtig*, *zeit-wirksam*, and *tagwichtig*, can be learned from a comparative study of these ten versions. Heretofore it was far too troublesome to approach the alluring task from the comparative angle. It is only a pity that this uniquely excellent study had to cost \$3.00.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD

*West Virginia University*

---

*The Use of Swa in Old English.* By E. E. ERICSON. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1932. [*Hesperia*, Ergänzungsreihe. 12. Heft.] Pp. 89.

With this doctoral dissertation a well trained and industrious investigator announces his entrance into the field of Old English syntax. The subject chosen for this piece of research and the analytical ability shown will make it profitable reading for all students of English grammar.

Dr. Ericson lists under twenty-four headings all the different uses of the form *swa* that he has encountered. He does not make clear what his plan of arrangement is, beginning abruptly (without introduction) with selected examples of *swa* as a Conjunctive Adverb and ending (without conclusion) with examples of *swa* as an Asseverative. Thus the eighty-nine pages of this study give the reader the impression rather of a series of isolated notes than of a connected study. The author has gleaned every use of *swa* from all the poetry and the first five volumes of the *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa*. It is regrettable that he did not read all the available prose in view of the fact, as he says, p. 5, that he was led to this subject because "up to the present time no one has attempted an exhaustive study of the word" (*swa*).

The form *swa* embraces so many subtle gradations of meaning and function in OE texts that one may often choose among several possible interpretations. Dr. Ericson in his analyses has often permitted himself to be influenced by the Middle and Modern English development of *swa* constructions, thus adopting an historical point of view. But there are cases in which a more conservative interpretation can be justified and, in the present reviewer's opinion, would be preferred. For example, p. 61, under the heading Causal Clauses, the OE *swa* still retains its modal force and it is extremely doubtful whether the causal relationship is expressed. Passages like *Beowulf* 1142, *Swa* he ne forwyrnde, which Ericson, following Kemp Malone, interprets "since he did not prevent his lord," etc. and *Andreas* 937,

Aris nu hrædlice, ræd ædre ongit,  
beorn gebledsod, *swa* þe beorht fæder  
geweorðað wuldorgifum,

which he interprets "for the bright Father shall honor thee," do not exhibit such a degree of hypotaxis as to warrant the causal connective that we use in Contemporary English. We shall be closer to the true syntax if we interpret all these examples from the poetry paratactically as simply "thus," "and thus," or "in this way." However, the author generally takes a conservative position throughout the study, and this is its outstanding merit. Cf. page 27, "*swa* as a pronoun," where he prefers to retain the original and basic modal force wherever possible: "OE lexicographers and translators have been too ready to render these pseudo-substantives as pronouns. Many of them give the clearest possible meaning if taken in the usual modal sense."

Dr. Ericson, although dealing with syntax over a period of more than three hundred years, unfortunately recognizes no distinction between early and late usage, between poetry and prose, or between dialects. The gradual spread of certain of his categories and the choking off of certain others have not been noticed; and the reader misses the sense of being brought close to a living and changing phenomenon of language, which might easily have been achieved. Which uses of *swa* belong to General Germanic and which sprang up in English alone cannot be told from his study; nor is there any estimate of the possible Latin influence, although the Latin is available in the texts used, and is occasionally cited. A student of syntax may choose to confine himself to the purely descriptive method. But knowing our author's broad training in General Germanic, and observing his occasional interesting use of the historical and the comparative methods, one is disappointed that he did not give his treatise a broad foundation. In the opinion of the present reviewer, the scattered nature of the OE monuments

on the one hand, and the accessibility of scholarship in the Germanic field on the other, make it incumbent upon the student of OE syntax to take the Comparative Germanic point of view.

A practice that students of grammar will find difficulty in overlooking is the failure to use important works on English and Germanic syntax and to place the treatise in the best tradition of OE scholarship. Of course, any investigator is theoretically free to set aside previous findings on his subject. All the syntactical categories of *swa* here discussed have been touched upon at different times by Wülfing, Jespersen, Sweet, Eitle, Einkenkel, Koch, Zupitza, Behaghel, and Delbrück, among others: but throughout the study no credit is given to any grammarian in this field, except references to one article by E. A. Kock and to three by Dr. Ericson himself on *swa* (properly parts of this study).

Moreover, Dr. Ericson places great emphasis upon the published translations of OE writings, his Bibliography being made up exclusively of thirty-seven translations and five Latin sources. The standard works on syntax and the dissertations touching on *swa* do not appear in the Bibliography and are not used in the body of the work. Seeing the microscope of syntax held up to the translations of Moncreiff and Hall for certain Beowulf passages, one instinctively cries for Klaeber, who has analyzed every occurrence of *swa*. Similarly, Wülfing has been entirely ignored in the discussion of Alfred's syntax.

But the student of language will find in these pages much that will increase and sharpen his knowledge of the OE *swa* group. In the words of the author (p. 5): "It would be presumptuous in the writer to lay too high a claim for the practical value of such a study. It will, of course, serve as a supplement to the various Old English dictionaries. It will establish precedent for the translation of *swa* in the Old English texts. But whether of practical value or not, it will at least serve to document the early linguistic history of the prolific *as—so* family."

GEORGE WILLIAM SMALL

University of Maine

---

*L'Histoire de la mise en scène dans le théâtre français de 1600 à 1657.* Par S. WILMA HOLLSBOER. Paris: Droz, 1933. Pp. 336.

*L'Evolution de la tragédie religieuse classique en France.* Par KOSTA LOUKOVITCH. Paris: Droz, 1933. Pp. xii + 471.

These two theses are the first volumes of the Bibliothèque de la Société des Historiens du Théâtre. Miss Holsboer gives, under an attractive form, a useful guide to those interested in questions of

theaters, scenery, costumes, and stage mechanisms. She presents her material clearly and adds thirty-two interesting full-page illustrations as well as, in an appendix, extensive extracts from Sabatini. It is much to her credit that, despite the fact that she holds a professorship in Java, she was able to make so good a synthesis of the work that has been done on the subject during the last two centuries. There are, however, a number of errors of detail that detract from the value of the book. As I understand that the edition has been exhausted, I hope that these will be corrected when it is republished.

P. 22, the title of my article in *RHL.*, 1922, is not the *Foire de Saint-Germain*, but *de Rayssiguier*. Pp. 33, 34, 49, etc. the numbers referring to the illustrations are incorrect. Pp. 65-89, she lays too much stress on theory in comparison with actual dramatic practice. P. 77, for 1655 read 1635. P. 78, for 1636 read 1637. P. 116, the "perspective circulaire" would not have struck her as "de pure fantaisie" if she had examined the engravings published with La Serre's *Sainte Catherine*. P. 133, *Polyeucte* was first played at the Marais, not at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. P. 134, the quotation from *Osman* is not altogether correct and Bernardin's explanation of it is not to be accepted. P. 136, Corneille was not opposed to the use of chains, for Syphax had worn them on the stage for some time before Lelius released him. P. 139, she repeats M. Cohen's erroneous statement in regard to the origin of the name of the Elizabethan theater, *The Curtain*. P. 163, for *Philisbée* read *Philisthée*; it requires considerable naïveté to believe that blood was represented by "sang réel." P. 168, how could a play by Racine be mentioned in a work published in 1662? *Mithridate* refers, of course, to La Calprenède's tragedy, not to Racine's. P. 182, as Scudéry's *Comédie des comédiens* was first acted at the Marais, there is no reason to suppose that Bellerose is represented by Beausoleil. P. 183, *Scévole* was first acted by the troupe of the Illustre Théâtre, and earlier than 1646. P. 184, Montdory, not Beauchasteau, created the rôle of Rodrigue. Pp. 183, 184, 191, 193, I have shown that the tradition, based on Chappuzeau, that Floridor succeeded Bellerose in 1643 must be rejected; it is in conflict with evidence that Miss H. herself publishes on p. 244. P. 186, it was at the Marais in 1637, not at the Hôtel in 1636, that la Beauchasteau created the rôle of the Infanta. Pp. 186-7, the wives of Brécourt and La Thuillerie were not "congediées" in 1680, but were then living on a pension paid by the troupe. P. 192, there is no evidence that *Don Japhet* was written for Jodelet; for Tessonnière read Tessonerie; *l'Amour à la mode* was written by Thomas Corneille, not by "Gusman." P. 202, why hesitate between evidence furnished by Corneille in regard to one of his own plays and that which comes from a publication of 1740? P. 229, repetition of the old error that Hardy was the only French dramatist of his day. P. 240, n. 1, for 170 read 429. P. 269, she cites Rigal incompletely, for he held that the teston was the price of a seat in a box, while admission to the parterre was only half that amount.

Mr. Loukovitch's thesis has less popular interest than that of Miss Holsboer, but makes a more genuine contribution to knowledge. It is quite superior to Miss Pascoe's publication, from which it differs not only in quality but in conception, for Mr. Loukovitch insists that he is not writing a history of religious tragedy, but is seeking "d'éclaircir la genèse, de fixer les moments de l'évolution

et d'expliquer les causes de la décadence de ce genre littéraire." He enters more fully than has been done hitherto into the history of clerical opposition to the theater, emphasizes the influence of the counter-reformation upon the composition of *Polyeucte*, *Saint-Genest*, and contemporary plays, and relates the decay of the *genre* to the hostility both of the Church and of polite society. While most of the documents he cites were already known to students of the drama, he makes at least one interesting discovery, a letter written to Conrart from Grasse late in 1637 in which it is shown that an unknown play, *le Favory solitaire*, had recently been performed at Paris. He is unsuccessful in his attempt to identify this with Baro's *Saint Eustache*, but he is probably correct in his claim that it is the earliest evidence we have of the performance by professional dramatists on a Parisian seventeenth-century stage of a religious play. It is, however, possible that the work may be a school-play and consequently without much significance. There are a number of errors to which I would call his attention.

P. 75, reference by an author to the nymph, *Astrée*, does not in any way imply that he was familiar with the novel of that name; for Jean Mainfray read Pierre Mainfray (also p. 327). Pp. 121-2, he quite fails to understand what I wrote about the resemblance between *Sainte Agnès* and *Polyeucte*. P. 123, there is no proof that "P. M." means Pierre Mathieu. P. 133, the parallels he cites between *Athénaïs* and *Polyeucte* do not prove influence. P. 140, as M. Magendie is far from showing that *Polyeucte* influenced *Cléopâtre*, L. is not justified in dating the play by the date of the novel. P. 150, farces were regularly acted after longer plays, not before. Pp. 154-5, what proof is there that the *Crispus* of Stephonius had any influence on the *Mort de Chrispe* of Tristan l'Hermite? P. 159, L. misrepresents my explanation of the causes that led Corneille to write *Polyeucte*. He would lead one to suppose that I thought he derived the idea from Heinsius alone. As a matter of fact, I mentioned the various possible influences, but, as there is no conclusive evidence, I was unable to assert which of them determined his choice; L. fixes on one of them without hesitation, for he needs no other proof in such matters than his own intuition. P. 209, l. 2, read Cauchon. P. 213, for 1600 read 1593-4. P. 233, Corneille did not need to look to Bartolommei for the emperor's victory over the Persians, since it is mentioned by Coeffeteau. P. 296, *Bradamante* and *Clarionte* are tragi-comedies, not tragedies. P. 323, there is no evidence that *Artaxerce* was played at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. P. 339, why look to a "cabale" for whose existence there is no evidence rather than accept the conclusion that Rotrou borrowed from Desfontaines, as he did from many other authors? P. 341, it is too much to say that Rotrou owed to Lope the "charpente de sa tragédie." P. 381, he seems to be unaware that the source of the *maximes* in *l'Ecole des femmes* was pointed out by M. Lanson years ago (cf. *Revue bleue*, Dec. 2, 1899).

H. C. LANCASTER

*Le Roman Belge Contemporain.* By BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE. Préface de MAURICE WILMOTTE. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, Belgian Series, 1933. xxi + 214 pp. \$1.25.

The subtitle of Professor Woodbridge's book indicates the scope of his study: "Cinq romanciers Flamands: Charles De Coster, Camille Lemonnier, Georges Eekhoud, Eugène Demolder, George Virrès." The book then is not to be considered a literary history; it is a series of five essentially independent essays, bound together by the emphasis placed upon the common effort of these writers to create a national literature. The need for such a study of these too often neglected Flemish novelists is discussed at some length in a preface by M. Wilmotte.

In the first chapter, after a few introductory paragraphs noting the venerable past of Belgian letters, and claiming as essentially Belgian the *Séquence de Sainte Eulalie*, *Aucassin et Nicolette*, the *Roman de Renart*, and the illustrious figures of Froissart and Commynes, Mr. Woodbridge proceeds to a detailed consideration of the novels of De Coster, and especially of his *Ulenspiegel*, which he characterizes as "la Bible nationale grâce à son heureux effort de lier le passé au présent et de forger l'avenir." In subsequent chapters W. treats the "roman lyrique" of Lemonnier, the "roman nostalgique" of Eekhoud, the novels of "un peintre romancier, Eugène Demolder," and finally the works of Georges Virrès, "romancier catholique." This fashion that W. has of coupling with the author's name a single adjective is effective, but the implications of this one word are sometimes deceptive. The very variety of these novelists, and the occasional suggestion of the paradoxical in their attitudes, tend to render inadequate such condensed generalities. The matter is however of little consequence, for during the course of each discussion the material is analyzed so fully and so honestly that the ultimate impression is amply justified.

Emphasizing the life and environment of the writers, noting the outside influences that touched them, W. interprets each author's character through the medium of his novels, persuading the reader by abundant quotations from these novels. In this way interweaving description with criticism, W. convinces by the very absence of arbitrary dogmatism, and at the same time brings even to the reader unfamiliar with the works of these Belgian authors a satisfactory portrayal of their essential characteristics.

GEORGE B. FUNDENBURG

University of Maine

---



*Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive.* Par RAPHAËL LEVY. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1932. Pp. 92. The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume V.

Dr. Levy requires no introduction to those interested in Romance linguistics. His competence as a lexicographer reflects much credit upon American scholarship. Since the death of his former teacher, Professor D. S. Blondheim, it is probable that Dr. Levy is now the outstanding authority in Judaeo-Romance. His *Recherches* offers 815 Old French forms: a few of them new words, while others have spellings or meanings not adequately discussed in either Godefroy or the *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* published by Brandin and Lambert in 1905. Most of this material has come from the marginal and interlinear comments on eight Hebrew MSS, which Levy designates as MSS B, C, D, E, F, G, b, and q. In this book the lower half of each page reproduces the glosses themselves in Hebrew characters with MS citations; the upper half lists the Old French words in Roman transliteration with renderings into modern French. An appendix closes the book where glosses on ch. L of Jeremiah are given from six MS sources and from the Brandin-Lambert printed *Glossaire*.

In his introduction Dr. Levy promises a future study on the value of these words for Old French. We regret that he did not include this within the present monograph. I might say, in general, that these Judaeo-French words show unusual compounds, such phonological changes as the disappearance of *s* when followed by a consonant, interchange of *d* with voiced *s*, frequent omission of the nasal, and various other sporadic phenomena. Above all there are some astounding semantic developments in certain words, as in the case of *aider* (no. 40). This translates Hebrew *tedaṣ'i* 'thou gainest unjustly' (Ezech., xxii, 12). Dr. Levy equates it with Old French *aisier* and postulates the semantic evolution "mettre à son aise, enrichir."

In this last connection I should like to make a query. Where the Judaeo-French word (which translates a specific Hebrew word in the text) is followed by a brief Hebrew phrase, Dr. Levy has apparently used this phrase as indicating exactly the meaning of the French word. In several instances I feel that this Hebrew phrase is intended as a comment on the figurative meaning of the Hebrew text and is related only indirectly to the Judaeo-French translation. For example: *badia* (no. 144) glosses Hebrew *zonov* 'tail.'<sup>1</sup> Having no further clue to the meaning of *badia* I should render it as 'tail.' It is followed by the Hebrew phrase *odōn*

<sup>1</sup> "Neither shall there be any work for Egypt, which the head (*roš*) or tail (*zonov*), branch or rush, may do" (Isaiah, xix, 15).

*va'eved* 'master and servant,' but this is surely a comment upon the entire figurative passage, *roš vazonov*, and is not intended to have any literal connection with the Judaeo-French word. But Dr. Levy renders *badia* as "serviteur." My reading of this word, from the Hebrew characters in the lower half of the page, is *ebadia*. If Dr. Levy had a specific reason for discarding the initial *e*- we should know of it. In word no. 806, *versure*, Levy gives no meaning, hesitating doubtless over the sense of Hebrew *viyodotem* which it glosses. This meaningless Hebrew form is certainly an error for *viyodehem* 'and their hands,' which I find at this point in a standard text of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>2</sup> In such a case *versure* doubtless meant 'palm' or 'underside of the hand turned up.' Word no. 60, *aloen*, is the normal Old French word for 'aloes,' occurring in all the early medical texts. I believe it is out of place here in a list devoted primarily to Judaeo-French expressions. The title which Dr. Levy has given this book does not indicate with precision the contents. French words occurring in glosses on Hebrew MSS furnish most of the material—not "anciens textes français d'origine juive."

This monograph is of capital importance and should be essential for every lexicographer in the Romance field.

URBAN T. HOLMES

*The University of North Carolina*

---

*The Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism.*

By CHARLES W. LEMMI. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. ix + 224. \$2.50.

Of late years there has been a new interest in the allegorical mythographers of the Renaissance and their influence, and Professor Lemmi, who had touched the subject before, in this scholarly book makes a thorough study of the sources of Bacon's *De Sapientia Veterum*. The introductory chapter is a solidly documented survey of the allegorical tradition from ancient times down, as represented by Natalis Comes, Boccaccio, the alchemists, Ficino and ancient and modern Neo-Platonists, Du Bartas, Sandys, Macrobius, Servius, and others. Coming to Bacon's work, Professor Lemmi devotes the first part of his book (pp. 46-150) to "symbols of scientific speculation." Controverting such remarks as one of my own, that a good deal of Bacon's exegesis seems to be original, Professor Lemmi quotes abundantly from such sources as those already mentioned, especially Comes, from whom "Bacon took over the bulk of his semi-Empedoclean cosmology" (p. 146). The way in which

<sup>2</sup> *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. Rudolf Kittel (Stuttgart, 1912).

Bacon adapts traditional allegorical interpretations to vivifying, elucidating, and adorning his scientific philosophy and aspirations is interesting enough to the casual reader, but Professor Lemmi's detailed demonstration greatly enriches one's understanding of Bacon and his age. At the same time, on the critic's own showing a good deal of Bacon's exegesis does seem to be original, however much traditional matter it starts from. The second part of the monograph, "Symbols of Worldly Wisdom," deals with those chapters of Bacon's book which are akin to the *Essays*; in these Bacon makes myths the text for discussions of problems of government and political conduct. Here also he draws at times, though less patently, on the mythographers, but more upon the non-mythological wisdom of such writers as Machiavelli.

There is not much room or occasion for supplementary comment. It may be observed that a number of Bacon's expositions, without his special scientific turns, had appeared in English in Abraham Fraunce's *Third part of the Countesse of Pembrokes Iuychurch* (1592); Fraunce of course was using the same and kindred sources. To mention only one item, Professor Lemmi remarks (p. 65) that Boccaccio seems to be the only writer before Bacon who associates the Fates with Pan as symbolizing the forces of nature; Fraunce apparently does so, near the beginning of his book, in a passage based on Leo Hebraeus (see *Dialoghi d'Amore*, ed. Caramella, 1929, p. 112). Professor Lemmi (pp. 4, 9, etc.), takes Legouais as the author of the *Ovide moralisé*. That identification has, I think, been long abandoned; see, for example, Otto Gruppe, *Geschichte der Klassischen Mythologie* etc. (Leipzig, 1921), p. 17. Sandys' translation with the commentary is said (p. 208) to have appeared between 1621 and 1626; is there any evidence that the commentary appeared before 1632? Professor Lemmi's pages have a minor blemish in the form of a rather excessive number of misprints, chiefly in English words; four Greek words (pp. 51, 53) are misspelled. The index is far from complete, even for the items listed, and there are not enough items, so that consultation is not so easy as it ought to be in a book packed with detail.

In general, whether or not one accepts all of the author's particular parallels and comments (and most of them seem to be acceptable), perhaps only a fellow worker in the multitudinous sources of Renaissance mythology knows what a devilish business it is, and can properly appreciate the labor and learning put into this valuable book. Throughout Professor Lemmi shows a feeling for Bacon's imaginative as well as his philosophic power, and a sympathetic understanding of his aims and methods. He sees his subject in a large perspective, and uses his findings to emphasize the fact that, like Spenser and most men of the time, Bacon stood—to quote again that celebrated youthful dictum—"with one foot

in the Middle Ages, while with the other he saluted the rising dawn of the Renaissance."

DOUGLAS BUSH

*University of Minnesota*

*The Tragedy of King Richard III.* Edited by HAZELTON SPENCER.  
Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1933. Pp. xxx + 254. \$0.60.  
(The Arden Shakespeare.)

Professor Spencer has given us in this edition of *Richard III* one of the soundest pieces of scholarship and one of the most interesting critical approaches that has been presented by editors of this Arden edition of Shakespeare's plays. He has not blindly accepted the Globe text, but has established one which is the result of a careful independent study of the problems involved. In the elucidations of his notes he makes liberal use of his intimate knowledge of conventions of the Elizabethan stage and of his insight into the drama of that time as a form of theatrical entertainment.

Certain points of view presented in Professor Spencer's critical introduction are important enough for a just interpretation of the play to deserve examination. His discussion of the relation between the various texts, particularly the puzzling one between F<sub>1</sub> and Q<sub>1</sub> is clear and his conclusions sound. In brief, his opinion is that the Folio is the closer of the two to Shakespeare's original intention and that most of the omissions in the quarto represent cuts made to adapt the play to the exigencies of the stage. The Q additions he considers to be largely actors' gags. However, he finds it impossible to regard the substantial addition in the second scene of Act IV (ll. 102-120), as of this sort. He asserts that it contains "one of the most effective theatrical moments of the play." However, a close study of the passage will show that its theatrical effectiveness is gained at the expense of obscuring the essential dramatic significance of the scene. Shakespeare at this point was at pains to show what effect the mention of Richmond's name has upon Richard's mind. It puzzles his will and directs his memory to brooding upon prophecies friendly to his foe. In other words, Shakespeare devised the scene as a vivid display of Richard when he first falls under the shadow of nemesis. The lines interpolated in Q<sub>1</sub> divert one's attention to a quite different interest—to the skill with which Richard plays with Buckingham's ineptitude in pressing his suit at this moment. The "Well let it strike" answered by "Why let it strike" is the familiar question and answer of actors working up to a gag, which Richard gets off in the last speech. The passage, then, instead of testing the editor's

theory, in the opinion of the reviewer, confirms it. The correct interpretation of these lines is a necessary preliminary to a discovery of the principle by which Shakespeare sought to give unity to this play.

The thesis of Professor Spencer's critical comment upon this tragedy is that *Richard III* is an inferior work of art. He is interested in driving home this opinion. He begins his history of the text with the sentence, "Little can be said for this play as a piece of imaginative literature"; and phrases of detraction appear throughout the introduction whenever the editor has the slightest excuse to insert them. The play he says has a "specious sort of unity." Richard, who is at the center of the play, possesses a character so rigorously fixed at the opening of the drama, that events do not affect him at all. The entire action, therefore, takes place on the surface of life and consequently is merely melodramatic. The play has been popular on the stage only because of Richard's electric energy and the corresponding vigor of the phrases which he speaks. They all call for dynamic movement and so make Richard "one of the most effective acting rôles ever written."

All this is well said, even if it contradicts the editor's earlier characterization of Richard as "a dummy, a stuffed shirt!" However, in directing his attention to proving that *Richard III* is a melodrama rather than a tragedy, Professor Spencer, in the reviewer's opinion, ignores one of the most distinctive features of this play. In this early, obviously Senecan, tragedy Shakespeare seems to have realized all the formal possibilities of his master's strange combination of dramatic lyricism and the exhibition of moral system built upon the conception of nemesis. It may be true that the action of the play takes place entirely upon the surface of life, but Shakespeare has worked that surface into an elaborate artistic pattern. The moral of Richard's ascent to a shaky eminence, to which he climbs under the false impetus of hubris,—of the darkening of his will as the shadow of nemesis falls upon him and of his subsequent fall forms the great arc of the play. Beneath its shelter are drawn, in one small curve merging into another, similar moral dramas of Clarence, of the Queen's kindred, of Hastings, and of Buckingham. Each one of these little arcs is subtly differentiated from the others by the distinctive way in which each character exhibits his hubris and the reception of his moral doom. Other examples of artful structural formalism can be found throughout the play. Thus Richard's wooing of Anne is balanced by his later wooing of Elizabeth. The scenes of antiphonal wailing and cursing present the same phenomenon on a smaller scale, as the stichomuthia does in the smallest dramatic unit of all,—the dialogue. This point of view need not be developed at length. The play is the most skillfully developed ex-

ample of what the late Barrett Wendell called the "operatic" tradition of the early chronicle play. It is a pity that an editor whose historical scholarship is so sure and whose estimate of the essentially theatrical qualities of Elizabethan plays so sound should neglect to make clear the carefully wrought dramatic formalism of *Richard III*, and its significance in the development of Elizabethan tragedy.

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

*University of Michigan*

---

*A History of Shakespearian Criticism.* By AUGUSTUS RALLI.  
London: Oxford University Press, 1932. 2 vols., pp. x + 566, vi + 582. \$12.00.

This is more anthology than history, though the critics are set forth, not by reprinting their essays, but by abstracting them, and though Mr. Ralli comments liberally. He displays indeed a pretty talent for summary; but his own critical position, if it can be called such, is incorrigibly, nay, wildly, romantic. One is disconcerted at the outset to find all the Americans from Emerson (whose final despairing estimate of Shakespeare is not mentioned) to Professor Stoll (whose most important monographs are neglected for several of his lesser studies), treated in a series of chapters headed "England." And Professor Sisson is condemned by an early contribution to appear under "France." It would not, however, be fair to infer unfamiliarity with contemporary scholarship, though Mr. Ralli seems most impressed with the Robertsonian heresy.

Yet, after making due allowance for every man's right to be as Platonical as he pleases, I remain dubious about the author's expertness. Goethe on Hamlet is flatly rejected; but Coleridge is praised for being one of those critics "who read more into their subjects than the text warrants." No one, to be sure, is fit to write about Shakespeare who supposes that a *literal* reading of the text brings to life the poet's meaning—of course that slayeth. But the text must never be forgotten. It is not a trapeze, from which the critical acrobat is to hurl himself through the more or less pure ether at the top of the tent, to land God knows where—on another ticklish swing, or in the arms of a fellow practitioner, or in the net—but, wherever, as a consequence of his own fantastic agility; it is a score, to be scrutinized, not after the fashion of many a lesser maestro, but with learning, imagination, and reverence, very much in the way a conductor like Toscanini gradually brings himself closer to Beethoven's or Wagner's wishes. Criticism, scholarship, the laboratory sciences themselves, may and often do profit from pure inspiration; yet art remains another thing. A work of art

may come into existence as naturally as a child does (though, while conception remains in both cases mysterious, birth is unquestionably facilitated by the application of a technique—in both cases); but first-rate criticism, that is, criticism both inspiring and realistic, calls for reason all the way along.

Mr. Ralli, who holds Coleridge the divine critic, does not mean that he was a masterly reader of score, perceiving the composer's intentions through the imperfect medium of notation and expression marks. Instead, we are told again, in transcendental phrase, how "the mystic feels his individual mind merging into a larger mind"—which is all very well when you are paying a visit in Xanadu, but extremely ill when you are trying to decide whether Iago's villainy is sufficiently motivated, or whether Hamlet delays unduly, or whether it was Shakespeare who invented that vulgar fellow, the porter at Inverness. For the Emersonian "Over-Soul" read "Shakespeare," and for the Emersonian "bard" read "Coleridge," and you have Mr. Ralli's idea of how the great romantic critic (in whom there is so much to praise, would his admirers more observingly distill it out!) arrived at "absolute critical truth." *Sic!*

Aside from Mr. Ralli's fundamental misconception, a serious weakness arises from his apparent belief that if "praise overbears blame" we have good criticism. Something, no doubt, can be said for using Shakespeare as a touchstone; but it is not unjust to observe that at many points Mr. Ralli is less concerned with the plays than with the dramatist's reputation. Incredible as it may seem, the name of Shaw does not appear in this book. Nor in view of the radical character of recent revisions in method and interpretation, was it wise, in a work published in 1932, to stop short with 1925. Nevertheless, while one can not escape the conviction that a great opportunity has not been firmly grasped, and that for laymen the author's commentary is likely to be for many years a powerful contribution to obscurantism, Mr. Ralli offers the student a very useful collection of materials. Its usefulness is unfortunately somewhat impaired by bad organization. The critical pieces are arranged in a woodenly chronological order, so that successive efforts by a single writer are often split apart, in several cases into both volumes, by intervening contributions from others; and the index is woefully inadequate.

HAZELTON SPENCER

---

*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch.* Herausgegeben Im Auftrage Der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft von WOLFGANG KELLER. Band 68 (Neue Folge IX. Band). Leipzig, 1932.

The present volume of the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* comes well up to the old standard of its best days, in size, content, etc. The

features which it has evolved in these sixty-odd years are known to all of us. Its *Bücherschau* and *Zeitschriftenschau* continue to give a brief summary of the year's publications on Shakspeare. This year, because of illness and other circumstances, only a few books are presented, but others are promised for the next volume.

One is reminded that in recent years various successful attempts have been made to supplement these features of the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*. But we still need to wait some years after the fact before we can get bibliography, index, summaries, etc. all together. It is time that the more mechanical features were gathered together in one project, somewhat analogous perhaps to *Science Abstracts*. We ought to have immediately abstracts of all the essential facts and conclusions of every item on Shakspeare, but wholly without comment. Most other agencies could continue as now, and themselves be abstracted. With such a system of properly indexed abstracts, one might have some hope of keeping within sight of Shakspearean research.

The *Theaterschau* indicates continued German interest in the acting of Shakspeare. The *Nekrologe* records the passing of the great Eduard Sievers, "der bedeutendste Sprachgelehrte unserer Zeit." The *Aufsätze* contains several interesting articles, though many of them of more purely German interest. In an article "Zur Shakespeare-Stenographie," Professor Max Förster directs his attention chiefly to an attempt at invalidating the conclusions of W. Matthews on "Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos," who had concluded against the use of stenography. Bright's "Characterie Table" is reproduced in facsimile.

There are two articles by Americans. Professor Draper presents "Some Details of Italian Local Colour in 'Othello,'" to the conclusion that, "The plays show a strange mixture of ignorance and knowledge—perhaps the natural consequence of an education largely self-acquired." Perhaps. But it is the reviewer's impression that the majority of Shakspeare's contemporaries who had the advantage of a formal education also show concerning Italy this same strange mixture of ignorance and knowledge. For knowledge of Italy did not come principally through the schools, but through other channels, at least as accessible to Shakspeare as to the average "educated" person of his day.

Dr. Tannenbaum contributes "Notes on 'The Comedy of Errors,'" an interesting and important article devoted chiefly to textual matters, and by consequence necessarily taking frequent issue with Professor J. Dover Wilson. Professor Wilson thinks the copy was prepared by dictation to a scribe. Dr. Tannenbaum gives an impressive list of errors such as are known to have resulted from Shakspeare's "calligraphic peculiarities" in substantiation of his argument that the copy was holograph. A further observation, important when proved true, is that, "Poets, even dramatic poets,



it may be reasonably asserted, are watchful of their verse and take pains, almost instinctively, to write their verses as they sound in their ears." This principle Dr. Tannenbaum aptly illustrates from the surviving copies of Middleton's *Game At Chesse*. But such a principle, when demonstrated for a given author, can show only relative closeness to the author's manuscript, never absolute identity with it.

Dr. Tannenbaum then submits a formidable list of emendations. Many of these, however, are only for the purpose of making the printed text exhibit the meter, as "T'admit" for "To admit." All are interesting, and most of them, I believe, are possible. But few, if any of them, are necessary. That is, so long as the present text makes sense, it is dangerous to emend it, lest we be merely "improving" Shakspeare. In evaluating these emendations, the reader will need to be well on his guard, for occasionally Dr. Tannenbaum, like Homer—or the rest of us—nods. For instance, he writes on i. 2, 40, "Inasmuch as the distressed father cannot know or take it for granted that his missing children are unhappy, we must, it seems to me, read 'unhappily lose myself.'" But the speaker is not the father; it is one of the sons, the gist of whose preceding speeches as well as of this one is that he is unhappy. Yet such a list of suggested emendations from one who knows his Elizabethan handwriting as does Dr. Tannenbaum is highly suggestive, and some of his suggestions may win converts. The article is of such importance that it may not safely be ignored.

T. W. BALDWIN

*University of Illinois*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*Modern Language Notes* extends a cordial welcome to *ELH*. *A Journal of English Literary History*, published by The Tudor and Stuart Club of the Johns Hopkins University. This attractively printed periodical is unique in several respects: it is edited by young men, it is sponsored by a university literary club, it contains no reviews, it appears three times a year, it costs only \$1.50. The length of time that a learned article dealing with English literature must wait before publication makes clear the need of another magazine in this field. The first two issues of *ELH* promise a journal of high standards which should be supported by all those interested in the scholarly study of English literature.

---

*Letters of Robert Browning.* Collected by T. J. WISE and edited by T. L. HOOD. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933. Pp. xx + 390. Perhaps the most interesting thing about these letters is their extreme dullness. The strange dissociation in Browning between the poet and the ordinary man comes out more strikingly than ever in these prosaic pages. There might well, indeed, have been rather fewer of them. Everybody writes, and nobody in his senses wants to read, casual notes of the type—"I am very sorry indeed to hear that you are unwell . . . I shall be delighted to dine with you next Friday. . . ." Life is too short. Surely an editor may be expected to edit such trivialities away.

Apart from this, the annotation is careful and thorough, although there are a few omissions. For example, Browning's reference to the kissing of the poet "Chasselain" (*sic*) by "Marguerite of Navarre" seems to be a garbled memory of Alain Chartier and Margaret of Scotland; the ludicrous slip of the poet, with his passion for odd words, in the "Cows and twats" of *Pippa Passes* might have been at least partly explained; and it is untrue to say that Beddoes' *Improvisatore* has never been reprinted (see Gosse's edition of 1928). Considering the doubts that have been thrown on Gosse's story of the horror which prevented Browning from examining the box of Beddoes manuscripts, which Gosse was allowed to see in 1883, it is of some interest, as rather confirming Gosse, that in 1886 Browning still confesses ignorance of its contents to Dykes Campbell—which is not a little surprising in view of the fact that it had been in his possession since 1872. Finally, it is perhaps worth pointing out that the recipient of the letters quoted on page 371 of the commentary is clearly William Michael Rossetti, not Dante Gabriel.

F. L. LUCAS

*King's College, Cambridge, England*

*The Lost Plays and Masques 1500-1642.* By GERTRUDE MARIAN SIBLEY. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1933. Pp. xiv + 210. \$2.00. "Concerning the lost plays of the period 1558 [later extended to 1500] to 1642, I have attempted to bring together all that is actually known and, in general, what has been surmised by modern scholars. Under each entry I have first cited the contemporary references to the plays, such as records of performances, notices in publishers' advertisements, allusions in controversial pamphlets, diaries, histories, and dramas of the period, items of expense for costumes and properties, formal licenses, and entries in the *Stationers' Register*. Next I have summarized the opinions of the more trustworthy scholars as to the nature of the plots, or as to possible identifications with extant plays." Masques are to receive

less full treatment. "Finally, in a separate group I have listed the English plays known to have been acted in Germany, most of which are either lost or hard to identify."

This is an excellent scheme of procedure. But one has some misgivings on missing the name of Creizenach from the list of "trustworthy scholars," especially when the lost English plays acted in Germany are to receive a special listing. That list itself is puzzling, "English Plays With Known Titles Acted in Germany." But one will look in vain here or elsewhere in the volume for such titles as *Julio und Hyppolita*, or *Tugend und Liebesstreit*, unless he knows the titles of the lost English plays of which they are supposed to be versions. A handbook which requires that the user already have greater knowledge than it supplies is to that extent useless. An index, or cross-titling would have helped this particular defect.

As one begins glancing through, on the first page his eye falls upon the startling information that *Absalon* was, "By Thomas or John Watson; a Latin play c. 1540, performed at St. John's Coll.ge, Cambridge." There is no question that this play was by Thomas Watson, later Bishop of Lincoln. The attribution to John Watson has been compiled from the "trustworthy" Fleay. Surely a compiler with all the essential facts on the cards before her ought to have caught so patent an error and have cast it into outer darkness. Else, she should have made no attempt at critical summary at all.

Perhaps the reviewer has merely had extreme ill-luck in selecting his passages, but at least his experience should serve as a warning that ill-luck may be had.

T. W. BALDWIN

University of Illinois

---

*The Great Duke of Florence* by PHILIP MASSINGER. Edited with Introduction and Notes by JOHANNE M. STOCHHOLM. (Bryn Mawr dissertation.) Baltimore, 1933. Pp. [vi] + xcvi + 234. *Philip Massinger's The Unnatural Combat*. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by ROBERT STOCKDALE TELFER. Princeton: University Press, 1932. Pp. viii + 196. \$2.50. (Princeton Studies in English, 7.) In a well printed volume, Miss Stochholm has given students of the drama an accurate text, 124 pages of admirably arranged notes, mostly glossarial, a full bibliography, and a long introductory essay. Accepting the Edgar-Alfrida plot of *A Knack to Know a Knav*e as Massinger's chief source, she traces the literary history of this story from the earliest chronicles to *The King's Henchman* (1927). More important is her conjectural account of how Massinger may have received the story by way of John Green and the English actors at Gratz in 1608 with their *Herzog von Florentz*.

Mr. Telfer's text of *The Unnatural Combat* is not without flaws. In one section of sixteen pages, for example, there are thirty-six unnoted departures from the quarto readings. The text, by the way, seems to be based on the copy in the Princeton University Library without reference to other copies. The printer, E. G., is identified as Edward Griffin. Despite numerous inaccuracies in detail, the notes are generally adequate. If, as seems likely, the meaning of 1, i, 53-5, is "I'll teach thee beyond thy years," punctuation should be inserted after "yeares" and not after "thee." Whether we agree that *The Unnatural Combat* should be dated 1621 (with Fleay) or 1624, Mr. Telfer's case for the later date demands serious consideration. And so do his arguments that Massinger's source was not, as has been generally supposed, the Cenci story. Instead, Mr. Telfer urges that the young Massinger went back a decade or two to Beaumont and Fletcher's popular *King and No King* for his chief themes, (1) unnatural hatred, and (2) unnatural love, and borrowed details from *The Laws of Candy*, in which he had himself collaborated. The arguments are not conclusive, but they make impossible the continued bland acceptance of the Cenci story as the source.

JAMES G. MCMAWAWAY

*The Johns Hopkins University*

*The Mind of Poe and Other Studies.* By KILLIS CAMPBELL. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. x + 242. \$2.50. Professor Campbell has long since established (by his editions of the Poems in 1917 and of the Tales in 1927) his reputation as a trustworthy editor and critic of Poe. The seven papers which make up the present volume, though originally presented at widely different times and places, carry on his studies with a single purpose, for they all deal with questions long in controversy and all were undertaken, "With a view to understanding the facts in the case."

Such objectivity is particularly desirable in the study of Poe, for since Griswold began it with his malign obituary signed *Ludwig*, writers about Poe have tended to fall into the two camps of attack and passionate defense. Even the most recent biographers, working after the lapse of three-quarters of a century, have not been able to escape the traditional mood. In such escape Professor Campbell is successful. The method throughout is that of an opinion from the bench fully documented with references to the evidence. If one misses in it the warmth of the author's own feeling about Poe or the glow of his imagination fusing the material into a new alloy, it is because these methods of treatment have been rigidly excluded.

The title essay, which takes as its starting point Lanier's com-

ment that Poe "did not know enough," is followed by similar studies of contemporary opinion of Poe, of the Griswold controversy, of the background of Poe's works and self-revelation in them, of his literary origins, and, finally, of the Poe canon. The discussion moves quietly and steadily, with such a wealth of reference that the footnotes would make a fair bibliography of Poe, and the conclusions show that the truth ordinarily lies between the extremes of opinion that have been somewhat recklessly expressed.

JOHN C. FRENCH

---

*The Education of Shakespeare: Illustrated from the School-books in Use in his Time.* By GEORGE A. PLIMPTON. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. x + 140. \$2.00. This little book is not particularly addressed to scholars, but any scholar will be glad to own it. Lavishly illustrated, chiefly by facsimiles of their title pages, it surveys "such of the books for teachers, the courses of study of Shakespeare's time, and the textbooks likely to have been used at Stratford as are in [the author's] library." Since Mr. Plimpton's collection is unique, and since his observations and summaries are both pleasant and admirably organized, he offers his readers a fascinating and instructive ramble among the Tudor schoolbooks.

H. S.

---

*Les Enfances Guillaume, Chanson de geste du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle.* Editée par J.-L. PERRIER. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies. Pp. ix + 151. \$1.50. This edition of one of the less well-known chansons de geste of the William cycle hardly does justice to its subject. In its superficial introduction of seven pages no attempt is made to place the poem in its setting or to discuss the significant question of its relation to the rest of the cycle. The editor states that the chanson, "sous sa forme actuelle, ne paraît remonter qu'au commencement du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," but gives no proof for this statement and does not undertake to date—or localize—the original. A short paragraph is devoted to language and versification in which only the language of the scribe is mentioned; there is no treatment of assonances or syllabification with a view to differentiating the language of the scribe from that of the author, and many characteristic linguistic traits of the text are passed over in silence. The Bibliography lists A. Becker's edition of the second part of the *Enfances Guillaume* but does not record H. Hingst's edition of the first part (1918) or the important studies of the whole cycle by Ph. Aug. Becker, Jean-

roy and Lot. Misprints are not uncommon in the text, e. g., there should be no period at the end of l. 39, the quotation marks should be deleted in l. 52, *on* should read *ou* in l. 61, etc. A small Glossary and a clumsy apparatus for indicating variants complete an edition which because of its convenient format may prove useful but which in many essentials leaves much to be desired.

Bryn Mawr College

GRACE FRANK

"An Index to mediaeval French medical receipts," published by ADA GOLDBERG and HYMEN SAYE in the *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins University* (Supplement to the Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins Hospital) 1, 10 (December, 1933) pp. 435-466, furnishes an interesting and useful list of diseases for which remedies are found in the scattered medical recipes in Old French which have been printed, exclusive of the more important Old French medical works. To Miss Goldberg's and Mr. Saye's bibliography of works concerning the physician or medicine in Old French literature may be added the following: Boutarel, M.: *La Médecine dans notre théâtre comique depuis ses origines jusqu'au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (n. p., 1918); Witkowski, G.-J.: *Les Accouchements dans les beaux-arts, dans la littérature et au théâtre* (Paris, G. Steinheil, 1894) pp. 441-453, *Le Mal qu'on a dit des médecins*, deuxième série (Paris, G. Steinheil, n. d.) pp. 1-10, and *Les Médecins au théâtre, de l'antiquité au dix-septième siècle* (Paris, A. Maloine, 1905) pp. 62-96. Joseph Hariz's *La Part de la médecine arabe dans l'évolution de la médecine française*, Paris diss. (Paris, Imprimerie "Graphique," 1922) gives a vocabulary (pp. 153-158) of French words, including medical terms, derived from Arabic.

Wesleyan University

GEORGE MOODY

*Medieval Faith and Fable*, by J. A. MACCULLOCH, with a foreword by Sir J. G. FRAZER. Boston (Marshall Jones), 1932. Pp. 345. The author says of his book (p. 7), "it is not a history of the Middle Ages, but it tries to show what men thought or believed or said or did regarding many things which if not wholly medieval are yet characteristic of the period. . . . An attempt has been made to trace the origin, in the earlier period, of certain beliefs and practices, and their development through the centuries. . . . The subject of medieval witchcraft has barely been touched, for that, in all its aspects, would require a volume to itself. At a

later time it may form a sequel to this book." One hopes that this sequel may come, and come soon, for Canon MacCulloch's present volume is a truly admirable piece of work. The book was written, not so much for the scholar as for the layman interested in medieval Christianity and in the superstitions which flourished alongside it (or in connexion with it). But scholar as well as layman will find in the volume a trustworthy and sympathetic account of an important aspect of medieval life and thought.

K. M.

---

*An Essay on Poetics.* By THADDEUS REAMY BRENTON. London: Oxford University Press, 1932. 58 pp. \$1.25. The theme of this highly dogmatic, and sometimes angry, little book is the sacredness of form and the aberrancy of the "moderns." It is a doctrine that commands more patient hearing than it did a few years ago, when the moderns were dazzling us all with promises which they have not kept; but the strict simplicity of Mr. Brenton's views may alarm those who would gladly follow him. He is not at all afraid of such terms as 'pleasantness,' 'evenness,' and 'elegance'; and in the discussion of metre and rhythm (which forms the chief content of the essay) he goes so far as to suggest a doubt whether rhythm as such is a phenomenon of poetry: "If, in general, rhythm aside from metre is a poetical tenet, it is only secondary to, and superimposed upon, metre" (p. 15). The influence of Lascelles Abercrombie's *Principles of English Prosody* is apparent here; and those who were disturbed by the antithesis set up in that work between rhythm and metre will suffer some real shocks from Mr. Brenton's elaboration of it.

MORRIS W. CROLL

*Princeton, New Jersey*

---

*John Galsworthy: le Romancier.* By EDOUARD GUYOT. Paris: H. Didier, 1933. Pp. xix + 233. Fr. 12. (Écrivains "Étrangers" series.) Presenting an over-facile picture of the novelist as a typical impassive British patrician, emotional only when dominated by inherited prejudices or moved by a kind of *panthéisme sentimental*, M. Guyot nevertheless says many good things well of Galsworthy, is often shrewd and sound in his generalizations, and his book is entitled to special attention because he was in correspondence with Galsworthy during part of the time of its composition and because it will be followed by the probably more conclusive and profitable *John Galsworthy: le Conteur, le Dramaturge, l'Artiste*.

ARTHUR E. DUBOIS

*Baltimore*

*Judith Dramen des 16.-17. Jahrhunderts, nebst Luthers Vorrede zum Buch Judith*, herausgegeben von DR. MARTIN SOMMERFELD, Junker und Dünnhaupt. Berlin, 1933. 185 pp. Professor Sommerfeld has reprinted six Judith dramas from the original editions, thus preparing a very useful text for the study of the drama as well as the history of staging. The plays selected cover the period from the late medieval drama staged with mansions down to the beginnings of the opera on stages equipped with painted scenery. It is an excellent touch to reprint also Luther's introduction to the Book of Judith in which the reformer expresses the opinion—naïvely arrived at in judging by analogy from his own environment—that the Jews presented this story theatrically as the passion play was acted in Germany.

A. E. ZUCKER

*University of Maryland*

*Der dramatische Vortrieb in Goethes "Torquato Tasso."* Von PEPI ENGEL. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, hrsg. von Franz Saran, Bd. 33 *Erlangen*) Halle, 1933. Pp. 77. "Vortrieb" is in this dissertation used to mean what is usually designated as dramatic action. The author believes that Goethe's *Tasso* has been generally considered undramatic because it does not conform to Freytag's or any other scheme of rising and descending action; in reality it is highly dramatic, conforming to the type of "Wellenhandlung." Graphs and a table of "Stimmungspunkte" are added to show how the drama ought to be played. The only way to convince the reader of the force of this argument would be to show him such a performance on the stage, since this theory allows vast room for subjective interpretation.

A. E. ZUCKER

*University of Maryland*

*The Student's Milton.* Edited by FRANK ALLEN PATTERSON. Revised edition. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1933. Pp. liv + 1170 + 119. \$5.00. Although the first edition of this work printed in good-sized type more of Milton's writings than one would have supposed could be included in a single volume, Professor Patterson, in addition to collating afresh all his texts, has now added about 200 pages: complete translations of the *Prolusions* and *Familiar Letters*, further selections from the prose, the four early lives, and extensive notes. Truly "here is God's plenty."

R. D. H.



*The Prelude (Text of 1805)*. Edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. London: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. xxxix + 327. \$1.50. (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors.) This edition is much less expensive and easier to handle than the monumental work of which it is a simplification. In it also one may read the first completed text of *The Prelude* free from distracting comparisons with earlier and later versions. Yet some of the most valuable things in Professor de Selincourt's earlier work are the long passages from Y and W that were later rejected, other previously unpublished fragments, and the variants in the early manuscripts which give to many passages and episodes a coloring different from what they have even in A. Since none of these are included in the present work it will be of little use to the scholar and may mislead the layman.

R. D. H.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION OF *CIPERIS DE VIGNEVAUX*. In attempting to re-date *Ciperis de Vigneaux*, Professor Krappe (*MLN.*, 1934, pp. 255-260) evidently had no knowledge of the recent investigations of a Hungarian student of the poem,<sup>1</sup> and thus, his conclusions will not prove acceptable upon closer consideration. His hypothesis, apparently not based upon a study of the text itself, endeavors, despite admittedly weighty objections, to identify an episodic hero of the poem, Philippe, a king of Hungary, with Sigismund, king of Hungary and emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, an outstanding personality of the first half of the fifteenth century. Three analogies are pointed out between the fictitious and the historic characters: 1, both are related to the emperor; 2, both are threatened by a Mohammedan invasion; 3, both beg and obtain aid from the King of France. On the strength of these similarities, Professor Krappe goes way beyond Cl. Fauchet<sup>2</sup> who placed the composition of the epic in the twelfth century, and P. Faris<sup>3</sup> who assigned it to the fourteenth, and conjectures that *Ciperis* was written between 1396 and 1415, his point of departure being the battle of Nicopolis.

Hungary played in the mediaeval French epic a purely conventional rôle<sup>4</sup> which the hypothesis in question ignores in asserting that "what the poet obviously had in mind was the Hungary of the fourteenth century."

---

<sup>1</sup> V. Machovich, *Ciperis de Vigneaux (Chanson de geste a XIV. sz.-ból)*, Bibl. de l'Institut Français à l'Université de Budapest 7, 1928.

<sup>2</sup> *Recueil de l'origine de langue et poésie française*, Paris, 1581, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. litt. de la France*, xxvi, 19-42.

<sup>4</sup> L. Karl, "La Hongrie et les Hongrois dans les Chansons de geste," *Revue des Langues Romanes*, LI (1907), 1-38.

Mediaeval Hungary, in spite of her manifold relations to France, remained for all the authors of the *Chansons de geste*, a fantastic kingdom, a country *pardela la mer*. Memories of the first crusade caused its inhabitants to be represented as heathen in the earlier monuments;<sup>5</sup> when mutual relations improved, the Hungarians appeared as Christians, but in scores of epics dealing with the Merovingian times or with Charlemagne they popped up without any regard for historic or geographic realities. There is not a grain of historic truth to be found in the numerous poems in which the Hungarians appear as incidental characters. *Ciperis* faithfully follows these traditions. The author knows absolutely nothing of Hungary besides the trivial fact that its ruler is a "riche roy." The only authentically Hungarian datum in it is the occasional praise bestowed upon the famous Hungarian horses. The poet presents a mythical city, named Morons, as capital of Hungary; the hypothesis, disregarding the tremendous distance from Buda to the Dalmatian coast, locates this city in Croatia, or rather, in Dalmatia, since Morons is assumed to be south of Spalato. Does not this interpretation defeat the very aim of the hypothesis, *i. e.* the identification of the fabulous characters and events with historic ones? A contemporary of Froissart would surely have known of *Boude, la cité grande et bonne* in which the French knights embarking on the dire adventure of Nicopolis were treated handsomely.<sup>6</sup> The city of Morons cannot be identified for the simple reason that it existed only in the imagination of a Picard rimester. The character of the imaginary Hungarian king is likewise quite in keeping with the conventions of the epic; indeed, as was pointed out by P. Paris, it is essentially the same as that of the Hungarian king in another poem of the period, *Charles le Chauve*; Philippe is the name of Hungarian kings in two more contemporary epics, *Florence de Rome* and *Naissance du Chevalier au cygne*. The matrimonial luck through which Philippe becomes related to the emperor surely does not identify him with Sigismund. The fact that the latter was related to two emperors by the closest ties of blood, being the son of Charles IV and the brother of Wenceslaus, contradicts the hypothesis rather than strengthens it. Add to this that Philippe, the fictitious Hungarian king, is presented in the poem as the son of the King of France, a conventional but significant motif which Professor Krappe leaves entirely out of consideration: this relationship alone would be sufficient to destroy the hypothesis. Let me mention in passing that other Hungarian kings were actually related by marriage to emperors, such as St. Stephen (979-1038) to Otto I, whose grand-niece he married, or Andrew III (1291-1301), who married the daughter of Albert.

The campaign of 1396 was not so exclusively French as presented by the hypothesis; indeed, it was a crusade in which Germans, Italians, and other nations also took part. True enough, the French had the lion's share in it, but, in reality, Sigismund's territory was not threatened by immediate

<sup>5</sup> P. Boissonnade, *Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland*, Paris, 1923.

<sup>6</sup> *Les Chroniques de Sire Jean Froissart*, ed. J.-A.-C. Buchon, Paris, 1837, III, 236.

invasion. This objection, however, could be counterbalanced by the consideration that a French poet would have been apt to exaggerate the danger from which France saved Hungary. But the fact that the battle of Nicopolis was a crushing defeat must not be forgotten, and especially not if it is assumed that the poem was composed immediately afterwards. No less a witness than Froissart records the lasting memories of the battle of Nicopolis: "et durèrent ces lamentations moult longuement parmi le royaume de France et ailleurs aussi."<sup>7</sup> It is unthinkable that such a catastrophe, involving thousands of deaths and the captivity of the flower of the French nobility, could have been represented within twenty years as a great national victory.

The hypothesis fails to meet one more objection. Sigismund was elected emperor in 1410. Since the epic contains no reference to the future elevation of Philippe to the imperial throne, the date 1415 would be dubious for this reason alone.

Thus, we may safely accept Machovich's conclusions. The epic chooses Hungary merely as an exotic kingdom, the location of which remained hazy to the majority of the readers. The struggle against the *heathen*, a conventional motif of the epic, may be the echo of the many fruitless minor crusades of the fourteenth century. Morons, the imaginary capital of Hungary, and Philippe, the fictitious king of Hungary, are devoid of all historic authenticity. Lacking any positive proof of agreement between the historic facts and the fabulous tale, one must give credence to the internal evidences enumerated by Machovich, which tend to confirm the assumption that *Ciperis* was composed about the middle of the fourteenth century.

ARPAD STEINER

Hunter College

POE'S POLITIAN AGAIN. Professor Karl J. Arndt's article in *MLN.*, XLIX, 101-4, concerning the indebtedness of a passage in *Politian* to Goethe's *Mignon* omits what must have been an intermediate source: the opening lines of Byron's *The Bride of Abydos*,

Know ye the land where the cypress and myrtle  
Are emblems of deeds that are done in their clime?

in which Byron apparently leans upon Goethe's "Kennst du das Land wo die Citronen blühn?" As Poe borrowed from Byron in other cases (cf. *The Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. Campbell, Boston, 1917, pp. xlv-xlv, where parallels between Poe and Byron are listed; *Politian*, however, is not included in the list), is it not probable that *Politian* is also indebted to the English poet?

WILLIAM BRYAN GATES

Texas Technological College

<sup>7</sup> O. c., III, 273.

EUGENE MANUEL, UHLAND, and SIR WILLIAM JONES. Readers of Prof. Hatfield's "To an *Albumblatt* of Uhland" (*MLN.*, XLIX, 5, 301-02, May, 1934) may be interested to know that there is an exact French parallel to the quatrain of Sir William Jones and that of Uhland there quoted. This is a quatrain called "le Commencement et la fin" by Eugène Manuel, a contributor to the 1869 and 1876 *recueils* of *le Parnasse contemporain*, and runs:

Enfant, à votre première heure,  
On vous sourit, et vous pleurez,  
Puissiez-vous, quand vous partirez,  
Sourire, alors que l'on vous pleure.

The little poem is found in Manuel's *Pages intimes* (1866—1st ed., Paris, Michel Lévy frères, 1866, p. 178) and was written between 1860 and 1866. It is possible that Manuel was acquainted with Uhland's poem, but it is more likely that the idea underlying the "Persian tetrastich" of which Sir William Jones' quatrain was a "literal translation" (*vide* the article of Prof. Hatfield) had become a commonplace in Europe by the middle of the nineteenth century. In any case, the existence of the quatrain, in almost identical words, in Persian, English, German and French is an interesting instance of literary migration.

It is an odd fact that, thirteen years after the appearance of Manuel's *Pages intimes*, the theme of "le commencement et la fin" was again cast into the quatrain-mold, without any acknowledgment of indebtedness to a previous poet. This quatrain is called "la Bénédiction du berceau" and is the final poem in *les Petits hommes* (Paris, Hachette, 1879), by Louis Ratisbonne (1827-1900), translator of Dante's *Divine Comedy* into French verse, author of a number of volumes of verse for children, but now best known as literary executor of Alfred de Vigny, whose *Journal d'un poète* he edited and published, chez Lemerre, in 1885. The quatrain runs:

A la lumière, enfant, tu viens d'ouvrir les yeux.  
Tout le monde sourit: seul, tu pleures, tu cries.  
Dieu fasse, au jour suprême, à l'heure des adieux,  
Que tout le monde pleure et toi seul tu souris.

Manuel's octosyllabic version is much more effective than Ratisbonne's alexandrine quatrain.

AARON SCHAFFER

*The University of Texas*

# INDEX

PAGE	PAGE
Abercrombie, L. and others, Aspects of Shakespeare: Being British Academy Lectures.. 423	Ammon, H., Dämon Faust.... 66
Acadiens louisianais et leur parler, Les — (ed. J. K. Ditchy) 188	Ancient Literatures of Europe, The ..... 348
Ackerman, R. W., Tester: <i>Knight's Tale</i> , 2499..... 397	<i>Ancient Mariner</i> , Another Source of the "Lonesome Road" Stanza in <i>The</i> —..... 111
Acre, Joinville et le conseil tenu à — en 1250..... 464	Anders, H., Die Bedeutung Wordsworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats..... 488
Acrostic, An Un-Noticed — and an Inglorious Poet..... 457	Anderson, P. B., English Drama Transferred to Prévost's Fiction ..... 178
<i>Æsop's Crow</i> , The Lost Play of — ..... 454	Anfänge des Puritanismus, Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Reformation, Die —.. 57
Agar, Neptune's '—' in Lyly's <i>Gallathea</i> ..... 451	Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709, L'— ..... 350
Ainsworth, E. G., Jr., Another Source of the "Lonesome Road" Stanza in <i>The Ancient Mariner</i> ..... 111	Anglo-Norman <i>Suite 'Work(?)'</i> 239
<i>Albumblatt</i> , To an — of Uhland 301, 562	Anibal, C. E., Lope de Vega and the Duque de Osuna..... 1
Alden, R. M. and O. J. Campbell, A Shakespeare Handbook.... 136	Appetite for Form, An —.... 226
Alfred, On the Continuity of English Prose from — to More and his School..... 477	Ariosto, Greene's Use of — in <i>Orlando Furioso</i> ..... 449
"Allas! allas! that ever love was sinne!" ..... 83	Arndt, K. J., Poe's <i>Politian</i> and Goethe's <i>Mignon</i> ....101; cf. 561
Allen, D. C.: A. G. Chester, Thomas May: Man of Letters, 1595-1650 ..... 489	Arnold, The Letters of Matthew — to Arthur Hugh Clough (ed. H. F. Lowry)..... 131
—, A Source for <i>Cambises</i> ... 384	Arrian, Who Was "The Late —"? ..... 500
—, B. S. Bruestle, The "Fool of Nature" in the English Drama of Our Day..... 489	Arthurian Romance, Classical Mythology and — ..... 415
—, Early Eighteenth-Century Literary Relations Between England and Germany..... 99	Ashmole, Lydgate's "The Churl and the Bird," MS. Harley 2407, and Elias ..... 90
—, Neptune's 'Agar' in Lyly's <i>Gallathea</i> ..... 451	Aspects of Shakespeare: Being British Academy Lectures... 423
—, P. K. Guha, Tragic Relief 489	Aubin, R. A., A Note on the Eighteenth-Century Progress Pieces ..... 405
Allusion to Bromley in the <i>Shepherds' Calendar</i> , An..... 443	—, Some Eighteenth-Century Sonnets ..... 507
American Adaptations of French Plays on the New York and Philadelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War..... 120	Auerbach, Berthold —'s sozial-politischer und ethischer Liberalismus ..... 492
— Notebooks of Nathaniel Hawthorne, The — (ed. R. Stewart) ..... 130	Aufklärung, Die Philosophie der — ..... 336
— Verse, The Idea of Union in — — (1776-1876)..... 349	Austin, H. D., Dante Notes... 312

PAGE	PAGE
<i>Aventures et le Mariage de Pa- nurge</i> , A Dramatic Adapta- tion of Rabelais in the Seven- teenth Century: <i>Les</i> — (1674) by Pousset de Montauban, with a Study of His Life and Other Plays..... 483	Beach, J. W.: R. Las Vergnas, W. M. Thackeray: l'homme, le penseur, le romancier..... 200
Averill, Esther C., An Undis- covered Bit of Verse by Long- fellow ..... 311, 423	Beall, C. B., Guez de Balzac and Tasso ..... 320
Avery, E. L., An Early Per- formance of Fielding's <i>His- torical Register</i> ..... 407	<i>Beau Monde</i> at the Restoration, The — —..... 425
Ayres, H. M., <i>Beowulf</i> , a para- phrase ..... 208	Bédé, J.-A., Chateaubriand et Marcel Proust..... 353
Babcock, R. W.: R. Las Vergnas, Le Chevalier Rutledge, "gentil- homme anglais," 1742-1794.. 196	Bedeutung Wordsworthscher Ge- dankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats, Die — ..... 488
Bacon, The Classic Deities in —: A Study in Mythological Symbolism ..... 544	Beginnings of French Uvular R, The — ..... 243
Balbuena, Glosses on <i>El Ber- nardo</i> of Bernardo de —.... 20	Ben, A Possible Origin of Con- greve's Sailor —..... 334
Bald, R. C., A New Letter from Charles Lamb..... 511	<i>Beowulf</i> , a paraphrase..... 208
—: C. J. Sisson, M. Eccles and Deborah Jones, Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans..... 486	—, Kommentar zum —..... 115
— (ed.), Literary Friendships in the Age of Wordsworth.. 137	Bernardo, Glosses on <i>El</i> — of Bernardo de Balbuena..... 20
Baldensperger F., Alfred de Vigny, Contribution à sa bio- graphie intellectuelle..... 421	Bernbaum, E., Recent Works on Prose Fiction before 1800 523
Baldwin, T. W.: Gertrude M. Sibley, The Lost Plays and Masques 1500-1642..... 552	Bestor, A. E., Jr., Emerson's Adaptation of a Line from Spenser ..... 265
—: <i>Shakespeare-Jahrbuch</i> .. 549	Beyer-Fröhlich, Mariamne (ed.), Deutsche Literatur... in Ent- wicklungsreihen. Band 5: Aus dem Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation ..... 337
Balseiro, J. A., Novelistas espa- ñoles modernos ..... 410	Biblical Verse, Tremellius, Sid- ney, and — ..... 145
Balzac, Guez de — and Tasso.. 320	Bibliographical Guide to Old English, A —..... 352
Balzac, Honoré de —. A Force of Nature..... 279	Bibliographie der Troubadours. 408
— in England..... 513	Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana ..... 190
—'s First Thought of <i>César</i> <i>Birotteau</i> ..... 516	Bickersteth, G. L. (trans.), The <i>Paradiso</i> of Dante Alighieri. 133
Baroway, I., Tremellius, Sidney, and Biblical Verse..... 145	Bion, Spenser, Ronsard, and — 139
Bashe, E. J. and A. H. Heusink- veld, A Bibliographical Guide to Old English..... 352	Blanchard, Rae (ed.), Steele, <i>The Christian Hero</i> ..... 342
Baudelaire, La Mystique de — 65	Blondheim, Necrology: David S. — ..... 424
Baudin, M., The Shifting of Responsibility in XVIIIth Cen- tury French Tragic Drama.. 152	Boethius, The Paris Psalter and the Meters of — (ed. G. P. Krapp) ..... 352
Beach, J. W.: A. Weber, George Gissing und die soziale Frage 200	Bond, R. P., English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750..... 340
	<i>Bondman (The): An Antient</i> <i>Storie</i> . By Philip Massinger (ed. B. T. Spencer)..... 118
	<i>Borderers</i> , The Date of Compo- sition of <i>The</i> —..... 104
	Bowers, R. H., Lydgate's "The

PAGE	PAGE
Churl and the Bird," MS. Harley 2407, and Elias Ashmole ..... 90	Bühler, C. F., The Sources of the <i>Court of Sapience</i> ..... 275
Boyd, J., Goethe's Knowledge of English Literature..... 67	Buffon et l'agrandissement du Jardin du Roi à Paris..... 279
Brackenridge, The Life and Writings of Hugh Henry —. 128	—, Un Résumé de quelques années de la vie de —. Lettre inédite ..... 317
Bradner, L., An Allusion to Bromley in the <i>Shepherds' Calendar</i> ..... 443	Burgum, E. B.: A. A. Brockington, Browning and the Twentieth Century..... 276
Bradshaw, H., <i>Life of St. Werburge</i> ..... 457	—: F. Shove, Christina Rossetti, a Study..... 68
Bredvold, L. I.: C. L. Day (ed.), The Songs of John Dryden.. 350	—: Frieda Vogt, Thomas Hardys Naturansicht in seinen Romanen ..... 202
—: H. J. Reesink, L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709..... 350	Burlesque Poetry, English —, 1700-1750 ..... 340
—: Jacqueline de La Harpe, <i>Le Journal des Savants</i> et la renommée de Pope en France au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle..... 350	Burnaby, The Works of William — (ed. F. E. Budd)..... 343
Brenton, T. R., An Essay on Poetics ..... 557	Burns, The Life of Robert —.. 127
British Academy Lectures, Aspects of Shakespeare: Being — ..... 423	Bush, D.: C. W. Lemmi, The Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism ..... 544
Brockington, A. A., Browning and the Twentieth Century.. 276	—: H. E. Rollins (ed.), <i>A Poetical Rhapsody</i> , 1602-1621 136
Bromley, An Allusion to — in the <i>Shepherds' Calendar</i> .... 443	—, The Date of Keats's <i>Fall of Hyperion</i> ..... 281
Bronson, B. H., James Robertson, Poet and Playwright... 509	Butler, Samuel — der Jüngere. 47
Brook Farm, Getting Ready for — ..... 36	Byrne, Mary, The Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England 274
Brooke, C. F. T. and N. B. Paradise (eds.), English Drama, 1580-1642 ..... 193	Caballero, Two Unpublished Anecdotes by Fernán — Preserved by Washington Irving 25
Brooks, C., Chaucer: <i>Saturn's Daughter</i> ..... 459	Cain, H. E., Marlowe's "French Crowns" ..... 380
Brown, C., Sermons and Miracle Plays ..... 394	<i>Cambises</i> , A Source for —... 384
—, The Squire and the Number of the Canterbury Pilgrims 216	<i>Camille</i> as the Translation of <i>La Dame aux Camélias</i> ..... 472
Browning and the Twentieth Century ..... 276	Campbell, K., The Mind of Poe and Other Studies..... 554
—, Letters of Robert — (eds. T. J. Wise and T. L. Hood) 552	Campbell, Lily B., The Lost Play of <i>Æsop's Crow</i> ..... 454
Bruestle, B. S., The "Fool of Nature" in the English Drama of Our Day..... 489	Campbell, O. J.: H. Spencer (ed.), <i>The Tragedy of King Richard III</i> ..... 546
Buckley, G. T., Who Was "The Late Arrian"?..... 500	— and R. M. Alden, A Shakespeare Handbook..... 136
Budd, F. E. (ed.), The Works of William Burnaby..... 343	Canterbury Pilgrims, The Squire and the Number of the — — 216
	Carlyle ..... 47
	Carstens, H. and A. Pillet, Bibliographie der Troubadours... 408
	Cassirer, E., Die Philosophie der Aufklärung ..... 336

PAGE	PAGE
Centeno, A. and F. C. Tarr, A Graded Spanish Review Grammar with Composition..... 64	Chinard, G.: F. Baldensperger, Alfred de Vigny, Contribution à sa biographie intellectuelle 421
<i>César Birotteau</i> , Balzac's First Thought of ..... 516	—: F. Lachèvre (ed.), <i>Le Royaume d'Antangil</i> ..... 413
Chadwick, H. M. and N. K., The Growth of Literature. Vol. I: The Ancient Literatures of Europe ..... 348	—: N. Van Wijngaarden, Les Odyssées philosophiques en France entre 1616 et 1789... 413
Chambers, R. W., M. Förster and R. Flower (eds.), <i>The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry</i> 347	—: W. F. Falls, Buffon et l'agrandissement du Jardin du Roi à Paris..... 279
—, On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School..... 477	<i>chive, stir</i> and ..... 98
Chandler, Z. E. and J. H. Scott, Phrasal Patterns in English Prose ..... 53	Chopin, Kate — and her Creole Stories ..... 192
Chanson de Geste, <i>Les Enfances Guillaume</i> , — — — du XIII <sup>e</sup> siècle ..... 555	<i>Christian Hero, The</i> — (ed. Rae Blanchard) ..... 342
Chappell, E. (ed.), Shorthand Letters of Samuel Pepys.... 278	Churl and the Bird, Lydgate's "The — — —," MS. Harley 2407, and Elias Ashmole... 90
Chase, S. P. (trans.), <i>The Pearl</i> 138	<i>Ciperis de Vigneaux</i> , The Date of — ..... 255, 559
— and Members of the Chaucer Course in Bowdoin College (eds.), <i>The Pearl</i> ..... 138	Civilisation française, Histoire de la — — des origines à nos jours ..... 351
Chateaubriand et Marcel Proust 353	Clark, Ruth, Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal.... 339
Chaucer and the <i>Pervigilium Veneris</i> ..... 80	Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism ..... 544
—, Ben Jonson's Appreciation of — as Evidenced in <i>The English Grammar</i> ..... 452	Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance ..... 415
—, <i>Canterbury Tales</i> 83, 216, 222, 397, 459, 461	Classicisme, Qu'est-ce que le —? Essai de mise au point..... 271
—: <i>Saturn's Daughter</i> ..... 459	<i>Clerkes Tale</i> ; The Job Passage in the — ..... 461
—, <i>The Legend of Good Women</i> ..... 226	Clough, The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh — (ed. H. F. Lowry)..... 131
—'s Age and the Prologues to the <i>Legend</i> ..... 87	Coleridge, <i>The Ancient Mariner</i> 111
—'s <i>Merchant's Tale</i> and a Russian Legend of King Solomon ..... 229	Collins, J. B.: C. F. Bühler, The Sources of the Court of <i>Sapience</i> ..... 275
—'s Mission to Lombardy... 209	Comedy of Manners from Sheridan to Maugham, The ..... 120
Chester, A. G., Thomas May: Man of Letters, 1595-1650... 489	Comparative Literature, Essays and Studies in English and — ..... 51
Chevalier, Marion F., A Dramatic Adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century: <i>Les Aventures et le Mariage de Panurge</i> (1674) by Pousset de Montauban with a Study of His Life and Other Plays.. 483	Congreve, A Possible Origin of —'s Sailor Ben..... 334
Chinard, G.: E. P. Dargan, Honoré de Balzac. A Force of Nature ..... 279	—, <i>Love for Love</i> ..... 334
	Cooper, The Social Criticism of Fenimore — ..... 422
	<i>Cosa Nada</i> en el Español Nuevo-mejicano ..... 31
	<i>Country Wife (The)</i> . By William Wycherley (ed. Ursula Todd-Naylor) ..... 118



PAGE	PAGE
<i>Court of Sapience, The Sources of the</i> ..... 275	alter der Reformation und Gegenreformation..... 337
Cowley, Milton, Jonson, and the Young —..... 158	Dialectgeographie, Friesche —. 422
Craps, The Palingenesis of — 190	Dickson, A., <i>Valentine and Orson</i> 68
Creole Stories, Kate Chopin and her —..... 192	Didier, Dans le Sillage du romantisme. Charles — (1805-1864)..... 195
Croll, M. W.: C. P. Smith, Pattern and Variation in Poetry 54	Dilthey, W., Von deutscher Dichtung und Musik..... 60
—: J. H. Scott and Z. E. Chandler, Phrasal Patterns in English Prose..... 53	Ditchev, J. K.: E. L. Tinker Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana..... 190
—: T. R. Brenton, An Essay on Poetics..... 557	—: E. L. Tinker, Les Ecrits de langue française en Louisiane au XIX <sup>e</sup> siècle... 190
Crowley, F. J., Two Unpublished Letters of Voltaire..... 181	—: E. L. Tinker, The Palingenesis of Craps..... 190
Curme, An Omission from —'s <i>Syntax</i> ..... 404	— (ed.), Les Académiciens louisianais et leur parler..... 188
Dämon Faust..... 66	Division of Words, The —.... 400
Dallas, Dorothy F., Le Roman français de 1660 à 1680.... 206	Drama of the Medieval Church, The —..... 112
<i>Dame aux Camélias, Camille</i> as the Translation of <i>La</i> —.... 472	Dramatic Adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century: <i>Les Aventures et le Mariage de Panurge</i> (1674) by Pousset de Montauban, with a Study of His Life and Other Plays, A —..... 483
Dans le Sillage du romantisme. Charles Didier (1805-1864)... 195	— Skit by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, A —..... 39
Dante Notes..... 312	— Works and Translations of Sir William Lower. With a Reprint of <i>The Enchanted Lovers</i> ..... 418
—, The <i>Paradiso</i> of — Alighieri (trans. G. L. Bickerseth)..... 133	Dramatische Vortrieb in Goethes <i>Torquato Tasso</i> , Der —.... 558
Dargan, E. F., Honoré de Balzac. A Force of Nature..... 279	Drames religieux du milieu du XVII <sup>e</sup> siècle, 1636-1650, Les —..... 204
Date of <i>Cyperis de Vigneaux</i> , The —..... 255, 559	Dryden and the Colleges..... 324
— Composition of <i>The Borderers</i> , The —..... 104	—, The Songs of John — (ed. C. L. Day)..... 350
— Keats's <i>Fall of Hyperion</i> , The —..... 281	Du Bartas, An Unpublished Letter of —..... 150
— Nahum Tate's Death, The —..... 169	Dubois, A. E.: E. Guyot, John Galsworthy: le Romancier.. 557
Davison, F., <i>A Poetical Rhapsody</i> 136	Dumas fils, <i>La Dame aux Camélias</i> ..... 472
Day, C. L., A Lost Play by D'Urfey..... 332	Dunn, W. H.: E. Neff, Carlyle. 47
— (ed.), The Songs of John Dryden..... 350	—: P. Meissner, Samuel Butler der Jüngere..... 47
Des Granges, Ch.-M. et O. Towles, Histoire de la Civilisation française des origines à nos jours..... 351	D'Urfey, A Lost Play by —... 332
Deutsche Dichtung, Von —r — und Musik..... 60	
— Literatur, Geschichte der —n — von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart..... 338	
— in Entwicklungsreihen. Band 5: Aus dem Zeit-	Early Eighteenth-Century Lit-

	PAGE		PAGE
erary Relations Between Eng- land and Germany.....	99	England, Soziale Lyrik in — 1880-1914 .....	66
— Performance of Fielding's <i>Historical Register</i> , An — ..	407	Englische Reformation, Die An- fänge des Puritanismus, Ver- such einer Deutung der — n — .....	57
Eccles, M., C. J. Sisson and Deborah Jones, Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans.....	486	English Burlesque Poetry, 1700- 1750 .....	340
Ecrits de langue française en Louisiane au XIX <sup>e</sup> siècle, Les — .....	190	— Drama, 1580-1642 (eds. C. F. T. Brooke and N. B. Para- dise) .....	193
-ed, Milton's Rules for — .....	166	— —, The "Fool of Na- ture" in the — of Our Day ..	489
Education, Literature and — in Early Quakerism.....	55	— — Transferred to Pré- vost's Fiction .....	178
— of Shakespeare: Illustrated from the Schoolbooks in Use in his Time.....	555	—, Essays and Studies in — and Comparative Literature. 51	
Edwards, B., An Unpublished Fragment of Gui de Cambrai's <i>Vengement Aliandre</i> .....	366	<i>English Grammar</i> , Ben Jonson's Appreciation of Chaucer as Evidenced in <i>The</i> — .....	452
Eighteenth-Century, Early — Literary Relations Between England and Germany.....	99	English Literature, Goethe's Knowledge of — .....	67
— Progress Pieces, A Note on the — .....	405	— Prose, On the Continuity of — — from Alfred to More and his School.....	477
— Sonnets, Some — .....	507	— —, Phrasal Patterns in — .....	53
<i>Elegies</i> , Milton, <i>Lysidas</i> and Propertius, —, III, 7.....	162	<i>Epistres morales</i> , Etude sur les — — d'Honoré d'Urfé.....	421
<i>ELH</i> .....	551	Ericson, E. E., The Use of <i>Sua</i> in Old English.....	537
Elizabethan Ballad of Malmero- phus and Sillera, An — .....	498	Ermatinger, E. (ed.), Philoso- phie der Literaturwissenschaft 123	
— Plays, written by Shake- speare's Friends, Colleagues, Rivals, and Successors (ed. H. Spencer) .....	50	Error in Dating a Letter of Montesquieu, An — .....	468
—s, Thomas Lodge and other — .....	486	—s and Omissions in the Griggs Facsimile of the Second Quarto of <i>Hamlet</i> .....	376
<i>Emendatio Vitae</i> , Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Ham- pole <i>Incendium Amoris</i> und — — und deren Übersetzung durch Richard Misyn.....	272	Español Nuevomejicano, <i>Cosa</i> <i>Nada</i> en el — .....	31
Emerson Today.....	345	Essay on Poetics, An — .....	557
—'s Adaptation of a Line from Spenser .....	265	—s and Studies in English and Comparative Literature. 51	
<i>Enchanted Lovers</i> , The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William Lower. With a Re- print of <i>The</i> — .....	418	Etude sur les <i>Epistres morales</i> d'Honoré d'Urfé.....	421
<i>Enfances Guillaume</i> , Les — (ed. J.-L. Perrier) .....	555	Evolution de la tragédie re- ligieuse classique en France L'— .....	539
Engel, P. Der dramatische Vor- trieb in Goethes <i>Torquato</i> <i>Tasso</i> .....	558	Ewen, F., John Gibson Lockhart, Propagandist of German Lit- erature .....	260
England, Balzac in — .....	513	<i>Æteter Book</i> of Old English Poetry, The — (eds. R. W. Chambers, M. Förster and R. Flower) .....	347
—, Early Eighteenth-Century Literary Relations Between — and Germany .....	99	Ezra, Milton, Ibn —, and Woll- ebius .....	506

PAGE	PAGE
Faerie Queene, "Occasion," —	Foulet, A., Joinville et le conseil tenu à Acre en 1250.... 464
—, II, iv, 4-5..... 391	Framing-Tale, The —..... 69
—, Spenser's <i>Shamefastnesse</i> , —, II, ix, 40-44..... 387	Frank, Grace: J.-L. Perrier (ed.), <i>Les Enfances Guillaume</i> 555
Fagin, N. B.: R. D. James, Old Drury of Philadelphia..... 491	—: K. Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church..... 112
—: T. C. Pollock, The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century..... 491	Französische Literatur, Richard Wagner in der —n—; 2. Teil: die Prosa..... 67
<i>Fall of Hyperion</i> , The Date of Keats's —..... 281	Frazer, J. A. MacCulloch, Medieval Faith and Fable. Foreword by J. G. —..... 556
Falls, W. F., Buffon et l'agrandissement du Jardin du Roi à Paris..... 279	French, J. C.: K. Campbell, The Mind of Poe and Other Studies..... 554
Faust, Dämon —..... 66	French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana, Bibliography of —..... 190
Faust, G. P., A Spenser Parallel 393	— Plays, American Adaptations of — on the New York and Philadelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War. 120
Feise, E.: E. Ermatinger (ed.), Philosophie der Literaturwissenschaft..... 123	— Tragic Drama, The Shifting of Responsibility in XVIIth Century — — —. 152
—: E. Sulger-Gebing and W. Linden, Gerhart Hauptmann —: F. Vogt and M. Koch, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart..... 338	— Uvular R, The Beginnings of — — —..... 243
—, Problems of Lyric Form. 293	Friends, The Literary Life of the Early —, 1650-1725.... 55
—: W. Dilthey, Von deutscher Dichtung und Musik..... 60	Friesche Dialectgeographie.... 422
—: W. Flemming, Der Wandel des deutschen Naturgefühls vom 15. zum 18. Jahrhundert..... 58	Fucilla, J. G., Glosses on <i>El Bernardo</i> of Bernardo de Balbuena..... 20
—: W. Kayser, Die Klangmalerei bei Harsdörffer.... 61	Fundenburg, G. B.: B. M. Woodbridge, Le Roman belge contemporain. Préface de M. Wilmotte..... 542
<i>ferwazzot</i> ..... 523	Galeran de Bretagne, Jean Renart and the Authorship of —..... 248
Fess, G. M., Balzac's First Thought of <i>Oésar Birotteau</i> . 516	<i>Gallathea</i> , Neptune's 'Agar' in Lyly's —..... 451
Fiction, Recent Works on Prose — before 1800..... 523	Galsworthy, John —: le Roman-cier..... 557
Fielding, An Early Performance of —'s <i>Historical Register</i> .. 407	Garvin, Katherine, A Note on Noah's Wife..... 88
Final S Plus N-Glide in Mexico 18	Gates, W. B., Poe's <i>Politian</i> Again..... 561
Flemming, W., Der Wandel des deutschen Naturgefühls vom 15. zum 18. Jahrhundert.... 58	—, The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William Lower. With a Reprint of <i>The Enchanted Lovers</i> ..... 418
Flower, R., R. W. Chambers and M. Förster (eds.), <i>The Exeter Book</i> of Old English Poetry. 347	Gawain's Leap, G. G. K. I. 2316 462
Förster, M. (ed.), Die Vercelli-Homilien..... 352	Gebhardt, Erma R., Ben Jon-
—, R. W. Chambers and R. Flower (eds.), <i>The Exeter Book</i> of Old English Poetry. 347	
"Fool of Nature" in the English Drama of Our Day, The —..... 489	

	PAGE		PAGE
son's Appreciation of Chaucer as Evidenced in <i>The English Grammar</i> .....	452	Gould, C. (ed.), <i>Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et sur les Voyages</i> (1728), par B. L. de Muralt.....	485
Geoffrey of Monmouth's <i>His- toria Regum Britanniae</i> vi. 12 and vi. 15, Note on —.....	94	Graded Spanish Review Gram- mar with Composition, A —	64
German Literature, John Gibson Lockhart, Propagandist of —	260	<i>Great Duke of Florence, The</i> — (ed. Johanne M. Stockholm)	553
Germany, Early Eighteenth-Cen- tury Literary Relations Be- tween England and —.....	99	Greene's Use of Ariosto in <i>Or- lando Furioso</i> .....	449
Gerould, G. H., Thunor in Kent	238	Griffith, R. H.: Rae Blanchard (ed.), Steele, <i>The Christian Hero</i> .....	342
Gerstäcker, Seitenlichter auf den Charakter —s.....	182	Griggs, Errors and Omissions in the — Facsimile of the Second Quarto of <i>Hamlet</i> .....	376
— über zeitgenössische Schriftsteller .....	302	Growth of Literature. Vol. I: The Ancient Literatures of Europe .....	348
Geschichte der deutschen Littera- tur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart.....	338	Guha, P. K., Tragic Relief....	489
— der mittelfranzösischen Literatur .....	481	Gui de Cambrai, An Unpub- lished Fragment of —'s <i>Venge- ment Alixandre</i> .....	366
Getting Ready for Brook Farm	36	Guyot, E., John Galsworthy: le Romancier .....	557
Ghosh, J. C. (ed.), The Works of Thomas Otway: Plays, Poems, and Love-Letters....	351	Ham, E. B., <i>Paire d'armes</i> ....	32
Gilbert, A. H.: Essays and Studies in English and Com- parative Literature. By Mem- bers of the English Depart- ment of the University of Michigan .....	51	—: S. Hofer, Geschichte der mittelfranzösischen Literatur	481
Gillet, E. (ed.), Maria Jane Jewsbury: Occasional Papers	280	Ham, R. G., Dryden and the Colleges .....	324
Gissing, George — und die soziale Frage .....	200	<i>Hamlet</i> , Errors and Omissions in the Griggs Facsimile of the Second Quarto of —....	376
Glosses on <i>El Bernardo</i> of Ber- nardo de Balbuena.....	20	—, Mr. Hughes' Edition of —	438
Godolphin, F. R. B., Milton, <i>Lysidas</i> and Propertius, <i>Ele- gies</i> , III, 7.....	162	—, Players' Quartos and Duo- decimos of —.....	369
Goethe, Der dramatische Vor- trieb in —s <i>Torquato Tasso</i> .	558	—, Thomas Hanmer and the Anonymous Essay on —....	493
—, Poe's <i>Politician</i> and —'s <i>Mignon</i> .....	101, 561	Hammer, J., Note on Geoffrey of Monmouth's <i>Historia Re- gum Britanniae</i> vi. 12 and vi. 15 .....	94
—'s Knowledge of English Literature .....	67	Handbuch der erklärenden Syn- tax .....	267
Gohdes, C., Getting Ready for Brook Farm.....	36	Hankins, J. E., Chaucer and the <i>Pervigilium Veneris</i> .....	80
Goldberg, Ada and H. Saye, An Index to mediaeval French medical receipts.....	556	Hankiss, J. (ed.), Théophile de Viau: <i>Pyrame et Thisbé</i> ....	63
Goldsmith's Translation of the <i>Roman comique</i> .....	171	Hanmer, Thomas — and the Anonymous Essay on <i>Hamlet</i>	493
Goudard, Marie L., Etude sur les <i>Epistres morales</i> d'Honoré d'Urfé .....	421	Hard, F.: D. S. Rankin, Kate Chopin and her Creole Stories	192
		Hardy, Thomas —s Natur- ansicht in seinen Romanen..	202
		Harley, Lydgate's "The Churl	

PAGE	PAGE
and the Bird," MS. — 2407, and Elias Ashmole..... 90	Highland Feasts of Fergus Mac- Ivor and Lord Lovat, The — 287
Harper, G. H.: E. Gillet (ed.), Maria Jane Jewsbury: Occas- sional Papers..... 280	Hinckley, H. B., The Framing- Tale ..... 69
—: Eva Walraf, Soziale Lyrik in England 1880-1914..... 66	Histoire de la civilisation fran- çaise des origines à nos jours 351
Harrington and the Jews..... 137	— de la mise en scène dans le théâtre français de 1600 à 1657, L'—..... 539
Harris, B., "Letter to C—W" 46	<i>Historia Regum Britanniae</i> , Note on Geoffrey of Mon- mouth's — — — VI. 12 and VI. 15, Note on..... 94
—: R. P. Bond, English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750 340	<i>Historical Register</i> , An Early Performance of Fielding's — ..... 407
Harrison, T. P. Jr., Spenser, Ronsard, and Bion..... 139	History of Shakespearian Criti- cism, A —..... 548
Harsdörffer, Die Klangmalerei bei —..... 61	Hof, J. J., Friesche Dialect- geographie ..... 422
Hatfield, J. T., To an <i>Album- blatt</i> of Uhland..... 301; cf. 562	Hofer, S., Geschichte der mittel- französischen Literatur..... 481
Havens, R. D.: E. de Selincourt (ed.), <i>The Prelude</i> (Text of 1805) ..... 559	Holbrook, W. C., Voltaire and Blin de Sainmore: An Unpub- lished Voltaire Letter..... 470
—: <i>ELH</i> ..... 551	Hollande, L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de — de 1684 à 1709 350
—: F. A. Patterson (ed.), The Student's Milton..... 558	Holmes, U. T.: R. Levy, Sur- cherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'ori- gine juive..... 543
—: P. Trahard, Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle (1715-1789). Tome III..... 268	Holsboer, S. Wilma, L'Histoire de la mise en scène dans le théâtre français de 1600 à 1657 ..... 539
—: R. C. Bald (ed.), Literary Friendships in the Age of Wordsworth ..... 137	Holt, W. S.: C. M. Newlin, The Life and Writings of Hugh Henry Brackenridge..... 128
Havers, W., Handbuch der er- klärenden Syntax..... 267	Hood, T. L. and T. J. Wise (eds.), Letters of Robert Browning ..... 552
Hauptmann, Gerhart ..... 65	Hooker, E. N.: F. P. Hett (ed.), The <i>Memoirs</i> of Sir Robert Sibbald ..... 134
Hawthorne, The American Note- books of Nathaniel — (ed. R. Stewart) ..... 130	—: R. P. Sechler, George Moore: "A Disciple of Walter Pater" ..... 137
Hayes, A. M., Wyatt's Letters to his Son..... 446	Hoops, J., Kommentar zum <i>Beo- wulf</i> ..... 115
Henderson, P. de F. and A. E. Zucker, <i>Camille</i> as the Trans- lation of <i>La Dame aux Camélias</i> ..... 472	Howard, L., A Predecessor of Moby-Dick ..... 310
Henning, G. N., <i>Le Sacrifice</i> of Leconte de Lisle..... 316	—: Dorothy L. Werner, The Idea of Union in American Verse (1776-1876) ..... 349
Herring, Margaret, Un Résumé de quelques années de la vie de Buffon. Lettre inédite.... 317	
Hespelt, E. H. and S. T. Wil- liams, Two Unpublished Anec- dotes by Fernán Caballero Pre- served by Washington Irving 25	
Hett, F. P. (ed.), The <i>Memoirs</i> of Sir Robert Sibbald..... 134	
Heusinkveld, A. H. and E. J. Bashe, A Bibliographical Guide to Old English..... 352	

	PAGE		PAGE
Howe, M. L., A Dramatic Skit by Dante Gabriel Rossetti..	39	Friends, 1650-1725. With an Introduction by R. M. —....	55
—, Dante Gabriel Rossetti's Comments on <i>Maud</i> .....	290	Jones, P. F.: J. Hoops, Kom- mentar zum <i>Beowulf</i> .....	115
Hughs, Mr. —' Edition of <i>Ham- let</i> .....	438	Jonson, Ben —'s Appreciation of Chaucer as Evidenced in <i>The English Grammar</i> .....	452
<i>Humanisme, Humanitisme, and Humanitarisme</i> .....	521	—, Milton, —, and the Young Cowley .....	158
Hustvedt, S. B.: Margarete Wil- linsky, Bischof Percy's Bear- beitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes .....	116	<i>Journal des Savants et la re- nommée de Pope en France au XVIIIe siècle, Le</i> .....	350
<i>Huttens letzte Tage</i> , Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: — — — An Historical-Critical Edition (ed. R. B. Roulston) .....	535	Judith Dramen des 16.-17. Jahr- hunderts, nebst Luthers Vor- rede zum Buch Judith (ed. M. Sommerfeld) .....	558
Idea of Union in American Verse (1776-1876), The .....	349	Kaufmann, F. W.: E. Cassirer, Die Philosophie der Auf- klärung .....	336
<i>Immensee und kein Ende</i> .....	34	—: Marianne Beyer-Fröhlich (ed.), Deutsche Literatur . . in Entwicklungsreihen. Band 5: Aus dem Zeitalter der Re- formation und Gegenreforma- tion .....	337
<i>Incendium Amoris</i> , Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Ham- pole — — und <i>Emendatio Vitae</i> und deren Übersetzung durch Richard Misyn.....	272	Kaut, Thelma, Chaucer's Age and the Prologues to the <i>Legend</i> .....	87
Index to mediaeval French medi- cal receipts, An .....	556	Kayser, W., Die Klangmalerei bei Harsdörffer .....	61
Irving, Two Unpublished Anec- dotes by Fernán Caballero Preserved by Washington —.	25	Keats, Die Bedeutung Words- worthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John —.....	488
Jacobson, Anna, Nachklänge Richard Wagners im Roman Jäckel, K., Richard Wagner in der französischen Literatur; 2. Teil: die Prosa.....	67	—, The Date of —'s <i>Fall of Hyperion</i> .....	281
James, R. D., Old Drury of Philadelphia .....	491	Kelley, M., Milton, Ibn Ezra, and Wollebius .....	506
Jephson, Robert — (1736-1803): A Study of His Life and Works .....	120	Kent, Thunor in —.....	238
Jews, Harrington and the —.	137	Kirk, R.: E. Chappell, Short- hand Letters of Samuel Pepys	278
Jewsbury, Maria Jane: Occa- sional Papers (ed. E. Gillet)	280	Klangmalerei bei Harsdörffer, Die — .....	61
Job Passage in the <i>Clerkes Tale</i> , The .....	461	<i>Knight's Tale</i> , Tester: — —, 2499 .....	397
Joinville et le conseil tenu à Acre en 1250 .....	464	Koch, M. and F. Vogt, Ge- schichte der deutschen Litera- tur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart.....	338
Jones, Deborah, C. J. Sisson and M. Eccles, Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans .....	486	Koenig, V. F., Jean Renart and the Authorship of <i>Galeran de Bretagne</i> .....	248
Jones, Eugène Manuel, Uhland, and Sir William .....	562	Kommentar zum <i>Beowulf</i> .....	115
Jones, F. L., <i>Paradise Lost</i> , I, 549-62 .....	44	Krapp, G. P. (ed.), The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius .....	352
Jones, Luella M. Wright, The Literary Life of the Early			

PAGE	PAGE
Krapp, G. P. (ed.), <i>The Vercelli Book</i> ..... 352	Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism .... 544
Krappe, A. H., <i>The Date of Ciperis de Vigneaux</i> 255; cf. 559	Lenton, Francis —, <i>Queen's Poet</i> 135
Kuethé, J. L., <i>Stir and chive</i> ... 98	Letter from Lamartine to "Gr. K." A —..... 519
Lachèvre, F. (ed.), <i>Le Royaume d'Antangil</i> ..... 413	"— to C—W"..... 46
La Harpe, Jacqueline de, <i>Le Journal des Savants</i> et la renommée de Pope en France au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle..... 350	—s of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough, The — (ed. H. F. Lowry)..... 131
Lamartine, A Letter from — to "Gr. K." ..... 519	—s of Robert Browning (eds. T. J. Wise and T. L. Hood). 552
Lamb, A New Letter from Charles —..... 511	<i>Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et sur les Voyages</i> (1728), par B. L. de Muralt (ed. C. Gould)..... 485
Lancaster, H. C.: Ch.-M. des Granges et O. Towles, <i>Histoire de la civilisation française des origines à nos jours</i> ..... 351	Levy, R., <i>Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive</i> 543
—: Dorothy F. Dallas, <i>Le Roman français de 1660 à 1680</i> 206	Lewis, C. B., <i>Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance</i> .... 415
—: J. Hankiss (ed.), <i>Théophile de Viau: Pyrame et Thisbé</i> ..... 63	L'Hommedé, E., <i>Le Secret de Shakespeare, Les Sonnets</i> ... 136
—: K. Loukovitch, <i>L'Evolution de la tragédie religieuse classique en France</i> ..... 539	Life and Writings of Hugh Henry Brackenridge, The ... 128
—: Marie L. Goudard, <i>Etude sur les Epistres morales d'Honoré d'Urfé</i> ..... 421	— of Joseph Wright, The — 346
—: M. Magendie, <i>Le Roman français au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle, de l'Astrée au Grand Cyrus</i> ... 206	— of Robert Burns, The— 127
—: Margaret E. Pascoe, <i>Les Drame religieux du milieu du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle</i> ..... 204	Liljegren, S. B., <i>Harrington and the Jews</i> ..... 137
—, <i>Necrology: David S. Blondheim</i> ..... 424	Linden, W. and E. Sulger-Gebing, <i>Gerhart Hauptmann Line in the Reeve's Prologue, A</i> —..... 222
—: S. Wilma Holsboer, <i>L'Histoire de la mise en scène dans le théâtre français de 1600 à 1657</i> ..... 539	Literary Friendships in the Age of Wordsworth (ed. R. C. Bald) ..... 137
—, <i>The Beginnings of French Vulgar R.</i> ..... 243	— Life of the Early Friends, 1650-1725, The —..... 55
Las Vergnas, R., <i>Le Chevalier Rutledge, "gentilhomme anglais," 1742-1794</i> ..... 196	— Sessions..... 351
—, W. M. Thackeray: <i>l'homme, le penseur, le romancier</i> ..... 200	Literature and Education in Early Quakerism..... 55
Leconte de Lisle, <i>Le Sacrifice of</i> —..... 316	—, <i>The Growth of —. Vol. I: The Ancient —s of Europe</i> .. 348
<i>Legend, Chaucer's Age and the Prologues to the</i> ..... 87	Literaturwissenschaft, <i>Philosophie der</i> —..... 123
Lemmi, C. W., <i>The Classic</i>	Littérature anglaise, <i>L'Angleterre et la — dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709</i> ..... 350
	Lockert, Lacy: G. L. Bickersteth (trans.), <i>The Paradiso of Dante Alighieri</i> ..... 133
	Lockhart, John Gibson —, <i>Propagandist of German Literature</i> ..... 260
	Lodge Thomas — and other Elizabethans ..... 486

PAGE	PAGE
Longfellow, An Undiscovered Bit of Verse by —..... 311, 423	Magoun, F. P., Jr.: R. W. Chambers, On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School..... 477
Lope de Vega, see Vega	Maîtres de la sensibilité fran- çaise au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle (1715- 1789), Les —. Tome III..... 268
Lost play by D'Urfey, A —... 332	Malakis, E: H. Peyre, Louis Ménard (1822-1901)..... 270
— — of <i>Æsop's Crow</i> , The — 454	Malmerophus, An Elizabethan Ballad of — and Sillera.... 498
— —s and Masques 1500-1642, The —..... 552	Malone, K.: A. H. Heusinkveld and E. J. Bashe, A Biblio- graphical Guide to Old English 352
Louisiana, Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Peri- odicals of —..... 190	—: Elizabeth M. Wright, The Life of Joseph Wright..... 346
Louisiane, Les Ecrits de langue française en — au XIX <sup>e</sup> siècle 190	—: G. P. Krapp (ed.), The Paris Psalter and the Metres of Boethius..... 352
Loukovitch, K., L'Evolution de la tragédie religieuse classique en France..... 539	—: G. P. Krapp (ed.), The Vercelli Book..... 352
Lovat, The Highland Feasts of Fergus MacIvor and Lord — 287	—: H. M. Ayres, <i>Beowulf</i> , a paraphrase..... 208
Lower, The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William — With a Reprint of <i>The Enchanted Lovers</i> ..... 418	—: H. M. and N. K. Chad- wick, The Growth of Litera- ture. Vol. I: The Ancient Literatures of Europe..... 348
Lowry, H. F. (ed.), The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough..... 131	—: J. A. MacCulloch, Mediaeval Faith and Fable. Fore- word by J. G. Frazer..... 556
Lucas, F. L.: T. J. Wise and T. L. Hood (eds.), Letters of Robert Browning..... 552	—: J. E. Wells, Fifth Supple- ment to a Manual of the Writ- ings in Middle English..... 138
Luther, Judith Dramen des 16- 17. Jahrhunderts, nebst — Vorrede zum Buch Judith (ed. M. Sommerfeld)..... 558	—: M. Förster (ed.), Die Vercelli-Homilien..... 352
<i>Lycidas</i> , Milton, — and Prop- ertius, <i>Elegies</i> , III, 7..... 162	—: R. W. Chambers, M. Förster and R. Flower (eds.), The <i>Æteter Book</i> of Old Eng- lish Poetry..... 347
Lydgate's "The Churl and the Bird," MS. Harley 2407, and Elias Ashmole..... 90	—: S. P. Chase (trans.), <i>The Pearl</i> ..... 138
Lyly, Neptune's 'Agar' in —'s <i>Gallathea</i> ..... 451	—: S. P. Chase and Members of the Chaucer Course in Bow- doin College (eds.), <i>The Pearl</i> ..... 138
Lynch, Kathleen M.: W. B. Gates, The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir Wil- liam Lower. With a Reprint of <i>The Enchanted Lovers</i> ... 418	Manly, J. M., Chaucer's Mission to Lombardy..... 209
Lyric Form, Problems of — — 293	Mann, Thomas —'s Novel <i>Der Zauberberg</i> ..... 419
Lyrik, Soziale — in England 1880-1914..... 66	Manual of the Writings in Middle English (Fifth Supple- ment)..... 138
MacCulloch, J. A., Medieval Faith and Fable. Foreword by J. G. Frazer..... 556	Manuel, Eugène —, Uhland, and Sir William Jones..... 562
MacGillivray, J. R., The Date of Composition of <i>The Bor- derers</i> ..... 104	Manuscript, A XIIIth Century <i>Oure Fader</i> in a Pavia —... 235
MacIvor, The Highland Feasts of Fergus — and Lord Lovat 287	
Magendie, M., Le Roman fran- çais au XVII <sup>e</sup> siècle de l' <i>Astrée</i> au <i>Grand Cyrus</i> ..... 206	



# INDEX

575

PAGE	PAGE
Manuscript, Harley, Lydgate's "The Churl and the Bird," — — 2407, and Elias Ashmole.. 90	Melville, H., <i>Moby-Dick</i> ..... 310
Marlowe, <i>Doctor Faustus</i> ..... 380	<i>Memoirs</i> of Sir Robert Sibbald, The — (ed. F. P. Hett).... 134
—'s "French Crowns"..... 380	Ménard, Louis — (1822-1901). 270
Masques, The Lost Plays and — 1500-1642..... 552	<i>Merchant's Tale</i> , Chaucer's — — and a Russian Legend of King Solomon..... 229
Massey, B. W. A., The Division of Words..... 400	Merton, S., A Letter from La- martine to "Gr. K."..... 519
Massinger, <i>The Bondman: An Antient Storie</i> (ed. B. T. Spencer) ..... 118	<i>Metaphysical</i> , The Pejorative Use of —..... 503
—, <i>The Great Duke of Flor- ence</i> (ed. Johanne M. Stoch- holm) ..... 553	Mexico, Final S Plus N-Glide in —..... 18
—, <i>The Unnatural Combat</i> (ed. R. S. Telfer)..... 553	Meyer, Conrad Ferdinand —: <i>Huttens letzte Tage</i> . An His- torical-Critical Edition (ed. R. B. Roulston)..... 535
Maud, Dante Gabriel Rossetti's Comments on —..... 290	Meysenbug, Malwida de —, sa vie et ses amis..... 492
Maugham, The Comedy of Man- ners from Sheridan to —... 120	Middle English, Fifth Supple- ment to a Manual of the Writ- ings in —..... 138
Maxfield, E. K.: Luella M. Wright, Literature and Edu- cation in Early Quakerism.. 55	<i>Mignon</i> , Poe's <i>Politian</i> and Goethe's —..... 101, 561
—: Luella M. Wright, The Literary Life of the Early Friends, 1650-1725. With an Introduction by R. M. Jones 55	Milton, Ibn Ezra, and Wollebius 506
Maxwell, B.: C. F. T. Brooke and N. B. Paradise (eds.), English Drama, 1580-1642.. 193	—, Jonson, and the Young Cowley ..... 158
May, Thomas —: Man of Let- ters, 1595-1650..... 489	—, <i>Lycidas</i> and Propertius, <i>Elegies</i> , III, 7..... 162
McManaway, J. G.: B. T. Spen- cer (ed.), <i>The Bondman: An Antient Storie</i> . By Philip Massinger ..... 118	—, <i>Paradise Lost</i> ..... 44
—: Johanne M. Stockholm (ed.), Massinger, <i>The Great Duke of Florence</i> ..... 553	—, The Student's — (ed. F. A. Patterson)..... 558
—, "Occasion," <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II, iv, 4-5..... 391	—'s Rules for —ed..... 166
—: R. S. Telfer (ed.), Mas- singer, <i>The Unnatural Combat</i> 553	—'s Seasonal Inspiration... 46
—: Ursula Todd-Naylor (ed.), <i>The Country Wife</i> . By William Wycherley..... 118	Mind of Poe and Other Studies, The —..... 554
Mediaeval French, An Index to — Medical Receipts..... 556	Miracle Plays, Sermons and — —..... 394
Medical receipts, An Index to Mediaeval French —..... 556	Mise en scène, L'Histoire de la — — — dans le théâtre fran- çais de 1600 à 1657..... 539
Medieval Church, The Drama of the —..... 112	Misyn, Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole <i>Incendium Amoris und Emendatio Vitae</i> und deren Übersetzung durch Richard —..... 222
— England, The Tradition of the Nun in —..... 274	Mittelfranzösische Literatur, Geschichte der —n —..... 481
— Faith and Fable..... 556	Moby-Dick, A Predecessor of — 310
Meissner, P., Samuel Butler der Jüngere ..... 47	Montauban, A Dramatic Adap- tation of Rabelais in the Seven- teenth Century: <i>Les Aven- tures et le Mariage de Panurge</i> (1674) by Pousset de —, with a Study of His Life and Other Plays ..... 483

	PAGE		PAGE
Montesquieu, An Error in Dating a Letter of .....	468	New Letter from Charles Lamb, A .....	511
Moody, G.: Ada Goldberg and H. Saye, An Index to mediaeval French medical receipts .....	556	Newlin, C. M., The Life and Writings of Hugh Henry Brackenridge .....	128
Moore, George —: "A Disciple of Walter Pater" .....	137	New York, American Adaptations of French Plays on the — and Philadelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War. 120	
More, On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to — and his School .....	477	N-Glide, Final S Plus — in Mexico .....	18
Morley, Edith J.: H. Anders, Die Bedeutung Wordworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats .....	488	Niemeyer, C., The Earl of Roscommon's Academy .....	432
Morley, S. G., Lope de Vega's <i>Peregrino</i> Lists not <i>Termini a Quo</i> .....	11	Noah's Wife, A Note on —....	88
Morrison, M. R., Greene's Use of Ariosto in <i>Orlando Furioso</i> .....	449	Norris, E. T., A Possible Origin of Congreve's Sailor Ben....	334
Moses, W. R., An Appetite for Form .....	226	Novelistas españoles modernos. 410	
Muralt, B. L. de, <i>Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et sur les Voyages</i> (1728) (ed. C. Gould) .....	485	Nun, The Tradition of the — in Medieval England .....	274
Musik, Von deutscher Dichtung und — .....	60	"Occasion," <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II, iv, 4-5 .....	391
Myers, L. M., A Line in the <i>Reeve's Prologue</i> .....	222	Odyssées philosophiques en France entre 1616 et 1789, Les — .....	413
Mystique de Baudelaire, La —	65	Old Drury of Philadelphia....	491
Mythological Symbolism, The Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in — .....	544	Old English, A Bibliographical Guide to — .....	352
Mythology, Classical — and Arthurian Romance .....	415	— — — Poetry, The <i>Ææter Book</i> of — — (eds. R. W. Chambers, M. Förster and R. Flower) .....	347
Nachklänge Richard Wagners im Roman .....	67	— — —, The Use of <i>Swa</i> in — .....	537
Naturgefühl, Der Wandel des deutschen —s vom 15. zum 18. Jahrhundert .....	58	Omission from Curme's <i>Syntax</i> , An — .....	404
Necrology: David S. Blondheim .....	424	On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School .....	477
Neff, E., Carlyle .....	47	<i>Orlando Furioso</i> , Greene's Use of Ariosto in — .....	449
—: H. F. Lowry (ed.), The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough .....	131	Osuna, Lope de Vega and the Duque de — .....	1
Neill, K., Spenser's <i>Shamefastness</i> , <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II, ix, 40-44 .....	387	Otway, The Works of Thomas —: Plays, Poems, and Love-Letters (ed. J. C. Ghosh) ...	351
Neilson, W. A.: F. B. Synder, The Life of Robert Burns....	127	<i>Oure Fader</i> , A XIIIth Century — — in a Pavia MS. ....	235
Neptune's 'Agar' in Lyly's <i>Gallathea</i> .....	451	Paire d'armes .....	32
Nethercot, A. H., Milton, Jonson, and the Young Cowley... 158		Palfrey, T. R., Balzac in England .....	513
		Palingenesis of Craps, The —..	190
		<i>Panurge</i> , A Dramatic Adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century: <i>Les Aventures et le Mariage de</i> —	

# INDEX

577

PAGE	PAGE
(1674) by Pousset de Montauban, with A Study of His Life and Other Plays..... 483	Pejorative Use of <i>Metaphysical</i> , The —..... 503
Paradise, N. B. and C. F. T. Brooke (eds.), English Drama, 1580-1642 ..... 193	Pepys, Shorthand Letters of Samuel — (ed. E. Chappell) 278
<i>Paradise Lost</i> , I, 549-62..... 44	Percy, Bischof —'s Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes ..... 116
<i>Paradiso</i> of Dante Alighieri, The — (trans. G. L. Bickerseth) ..... 133	<i>Peregrino</i> , Lope de Vega's — Lists not <i>Termini a Quo</i> ..... 11
Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius, The — (ed. G. P. Krapp)..... 352	Périodiques français, L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens — de Hollande de 1684 à 1709 350
Parny as an Opponent of Slavery ..... 360	Perrier, J.-L. (ed.), <i>Les Enfances Guillaume</i> ..... 555
Parrott, T. M., Errors and Omissions in the Griggs Facsimile of the Second Quarto of <i>Hamlet</i> ..... 376	Perry, B., Emerson Today..... 345
—: H. Spencer (ed.), Elizabethan Plays, written by Shakespeare's Friends, Colleagues, Rivals, and Successors 50	<i>Pervigilium Veneris</i> , Chaucer and the — ..... 80
Parsons, C. O., The Highland Feasts of Fergus MacIvor and Lord Lovat..... 287	Peterson, M. S., Robert Jephson (1736-1803): A Study of His Life and Works ..... 120
Parsons, E. S., Milton's Seasonal Inspiration..... 46	Peyre, H., Louis Ménard (1822-1901) ..... 270
Partridge, E., Literary Sessions 351	—, Qu'est-ce que le classicisme? Essai de mise au point 271
Pascoe, Margaret E., Les Drame religieux du milieu du XVII <sup>e</sup> siècle ..... 204	Philadelphia, American Adaptations of French Plays on the New York and — Stages from 1834 to the Civil War..... 120
Patch, H. R.: C. B. Lewis, Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance..... 415	—, Old Drury of —..... 491
—: H. Schöffler, Die Anfänge des Puritanismus, Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Reformation ..... 57	—, Theatre in the Eighteenth Century, The —..... 491
—: Mary Byrne, The Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England ..... 274	Philosophie der Aufklärung, Die —..... 336
Pater, George Moore: "A Disciple of Walter —"..... 137	— der Literaturwissenschaft 123
Pattern and Variation in Poetry 54	Phrasal Patterns in English Prose ..... 53
Patterson, F. A. (ed.), The Student's Milton..... 558	Pillet, A. and H. Carstens, Bibliographie der Troubadours 408
Paul, H. N., Mr. Hughs' Edition of <i>Hamlet</i> ..... 438	Players' Quartos and Duodecimos of <i>Hamlet</i> ..... 369
—, Players' Quartos and Duodecimos of <i>Hamlet</i> ..... 369	Plays, Elizabethan —, written by Shakespeare's Friends, Colleagues, Rivals, and Successors (ed. H. Spencer)..... 50
Pavia MS., A XIII <sup>th</sup> Century <i>Oure Fader</i> in a —..... 235	—, The Lost — and Masques 1500-1642 ..... 552
<i>Pearl</i> , The — (eds. S. P. Chase and Members of the Chaucer Course in Bowdoin College). 138	Plimpton, G. A., The Education of Shakespeare: Illustrated from the Schoolbooks in Use in his Time..... 555
— (trans. S. P. Chase)..... 138	Plurals, Should there be any — in <i>oes</i> ?..... 95
	Poe, The Mind of — and Other Studies ..... 554
	—'s <i>Politician</i> and Goethe's <i>Mignon</i> ..... 101, 561

PAGE	PAGE
<i>Poetical Rhapsody</i> , A —, 1602-1621 (ed. H. E. Rollins).... 136	R, The Beginnings of French Uvular ..... 243
Poetics, An Essay on ..... 557	Rabelais, A Dramatic Adaptation of — in the Seventeenth Century: <i>Les Aventures et le Mariage de Panurge</i> (1674) by Pousset de Montauban, with a Study of His Life and Other Plays..... 483
Poetry, Pattern and Variation in ..... 54	Rael, J. B., <i>Cosa Nada</i> en el Español Nuevomejicano..... 31
<i>Politian</i> , Poe's — and Goethe's <i>Mignon</i> ..... 101, 561	Ralli, A., A History of Shakespearean Criticism..... 548
Pollard, E. A., <i>Fervazzot</i> ..... 523	Rankin, D. S., Kate Chopin and her Creole Stories..... 192
Pollock, T. C., The Philadelphia Theatre in the Eighteenth Century ..... 491	Raysor, T. M.: E. Partridge, Literary Sessions..... 351
Pommier, J., <i>La Mystique de Baudelaire</i> ..... 65	Recent Works on Prose Fiction before 1800..... 523
Pope, <i>Le Journal des Savants</i> et la renommée de — en France au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle.... 350	Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive..... 543
Porterfield, A. W.: R. B. Roulston (ed.), Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: <i>Huttens letzte Tage</i> . An Historical-Critical Edition 535	Reesink, H. J., L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709..... 350
Port Royal, Strangers and Sojourners at — ..... 339	<i>Reeve's Prologue</i> , A Line in the — ..... 222
Possible Origin of Congreve's Sailor Ben, A — ..... 334	Reformation, Deutsche Literatur . . . in Entwicklungsreihen. Band 5: Aus dem Zeitalter der — und Gegen- — ..... 337
Prahl, A. J., Gerstäcker über zeitgenössische Schriftsteller —, <i>Seitenlichter auf den Charakter Gerstäckers</i> ..... 182	—, Die Anfänge des Puritanismus, Versuch einer Deutung der englischen — ..... 57
Predecessor of Moby-Dick, A — ..... 310	Renart, Jean — and the Authorship of <i>Galeran de Bretagne</i> 248
<i>Prelude</i> , The — (Text of 1805; ed. E. de Selincourt)..... 559	Restoration, The <i>Beau Monde</i> at the ..... 425
Preston, T., <i>Cambises</i> ..... 384	Résumé de quelques années de la vie de Buffon. Lettre inédite ..... 317
Prévost, English Drama Transferred to —'s Fiction..... 178	<i>Richard III</i> , The Tragedy of King — (ed. H. Spencer).. 546
Price, E. H., An Error in Dating a Letter of Montesquieu.... 468	Robertson, James —, Poet and Playwright ..... 509
Problems of Lyric Form..... 293	Robles, J.: F. C. Tarr and A. Centeno, A Graded Spanish Review Grammar with Composition ..... 64
Progress Pieces, A Note on the Eighteenth-Century — ..... 405	—: J. A. Balseiro, Novelistas españoles modernos..... 410
Propertius, Milton, <i>Lycidas</i> and —, <i>Elegies</i> , III, 7..... 162	Roesch, Lydia, <i>Immensee</i> und kein Ende..... 34
Prose Fiction, Recent Works on — before 1800..... 523	Rolle, Die Traktate des Richard — von Hampole <i>Incendium</i>
—, Phrasal Patterns in English — ..... 53	
Proust, Chateaubriand et Marcel — ..... 353	
Puritanismus, Die Anfänge des —, Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Reformation 57	
<i>Pyrame et Thisbé</i> , Théophile de Viau: — (ed. J. Hankiss) .. 63	
Quakerism, Literature and Education in Early — ..... 55	
Qu'est-ce que le classicisme? Essai de mise au point..... 271	

PAGE	PAGE
<i>Amoris und Emendatio Vitae</i> und deren Übersetzung durch Richard Misyn..... 272	Manners from Sheridan to Maugham ..... 120
Rollins, H. E., An Elizabethan Ballad of Malmerophus and Sillera ..... 498	Saye, H. and Ada Goldberg, An Index to mediaeval French medical receipts..... 556
— (ed.), <i>A Poetical Rhapsody</i> , 1602-1621 ..... 136	Scarron, <i>Roman comique</i> ..... 171
Roman belge contemporain, Le — ..... 542	Schaffer, A., Eugène Manuel, Uhland, and Sir William Jones ..... 562
<i>Roman comique</i> , Goldsmith's Translation of the —..... 171	Schinz, A.: C. Gould (ed.), <i>Let- tres sur les Anglois et les Francois et sur les Voyages</i> (1728), par B. L. de Muralt. 485
Roman français au XVII <sup>e</sup> siècle, de l' <i>Astrée</i> au <i>Grand Cyrus</i> , Le —..... 206	Schlauch, Margaret, Chaucer's <i>Merchant's Tale</i> and a Rus- sian Legend of King Solomon 229
— de 1660 à 1680, Le —... 206	Schnell, E., Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole <i>Incendium Amoris und Emen- datio Vitae</i> und deren Über- setzung durch Richard Misyn 272
Romantisme, Dans le Sillage du — Charles Didier (1805- 1864) ..... 195	Schöffler, H., Die Anfänge des Puritanismus, Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Re- formation. .... 57
Ronsard, Spenser, —, and Bion 139	Scott, J. H. and Z. E. Chandler, Phrasal Patterns in English Prose ..... 53
Roscommon, The Earl of —'s Academy ..... 432	Scott, <i>Waverley</i> ..... 287
Ross, J. E., The Social Criti- cism of Fenimore Cooper.... 422	Scott-Thomas, H. F., The Date of Nahum Tate's Death.... 169
Rossetti, Christina —, a Study 68	Sechler, R. P., George Moore: "A Disciple of Walter Pater" 137
Rossetti, A Dramatic Skit by Dante Gabriel —..... 39	Secret de Shakespeare, Les Sonnets, Le —..... 136
—, Dante Gabriel —'s Com- ments on <i>Maud</i> ..... 290	Seeber, E. D., <i>Humanisme</i> , <i>Humanitisme</i> , and <i>Humani- tarisme</i> ..... 521
Roulston, R. B. (ed.), Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: <i>Huttens letzte Tage</i> . An Historical- Critical Edition..... 535	—, Parny as an Opponent of Slavery ..... 360
<i>Royaume d'Antangil</i> , Le — (ed. F. Lachèvre)..... 413	Sehrt, E. H.: J. J. Hof, Friesche Dialectgeographie ..... 422
Russian legend, Chaucer's <i>Mer- chant's Tale</i> and a — — of King Solomon..... 229	Seitenlichter auf den Charakter Gerstäckers ..... 182
Rutledge, Le Chevalier —, "gen- tilhomme anglais," 1742-1794 196	Selincourt, E. de (ed.), <i>The Prelude</i> (Text of 1805).... 559
S, Final — Plus N-Glide in Mexico ..... 18	Sellards, J., Dans le Sillage du romantisme. Charles Didier (1805-1864) ..... 195
<i>Sacrifice</i> , Le — of Leconte de Lisle ..... 316	Sensibilité française, Les Maîtres de la — — au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle (1715-1789). Tome III..... 268
Sainmore, Voltaire and Blin de —: An Unpublished Voltaire Letter ..... 470	Sermons and Miracle Plays... 394
Salter, F. M., An Un-Noticed Acrostic and an Inglorious Poet ..... 457	Seventeenth Century French Tragic Drama, The Shifting of Responsibility in —..... 152
<i>Santa Juana</i> , Tirso's —, <i>Pri- mera Parte</i> ..... 13	
<i>Saturn's Daughter</i> , Chaucer: — — ..... 459	
Savage, H. L., A Note on <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> 232	
Sawyer, N. W., The Comedy of	

PAGE	PAGE
Severs, J. B., <i>The Job Passage</i> in the <i>Clerkes Tale</i> ..... 461	Sillera, An Elizabethan Ballad of Malmerophus and —..... 498
Shaaßer, M. A.: E. L'Hommedé, Le Secret de Shakespeare, Les Sonnets ..... 136	<i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> , Gawain's Leap: — l. 2316 ..... 462
—: R. M. Alden and O. J. Campbell, A Shakespeare Handbook ..... 136	— 2035, A Note on —..... 232
—: S. B. Liljegren, Harring- ton and the Jews..... 137	Sisson, C. J., M. Eccles and Deborah Jones, Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans..... 486
Shakespeare, Aspects of —: Be- ing British Academy Lectures 423	Slaughter, E. E., "Allas! allas! that ever love was sinne!".. 83
—, Elizabethan Plays, writ- ten by —'s Friends, Col- leagues, Rivals, and Suc- cessors (ed. H. Spencer).... 50	Slavery, Parny as an Opponent of ..... 360
—, <i>Hamlet</i> ... 369, 376, 438, 493	Small, G. W.: E. E. Ericson, The Use of <i>Swa</i> in Old English 537
— Handbook, A ..... 136	Smith, C. P., Pattern and Varia- tion in Poetry..... 54
—, Le secret de —, Les Son- nets ..... 136	Smith, H.: H. Peyre, Qu'est-ce que le classicisme? Essai de mise au point..... 271
—, <i>Richard III</i> ..... 546	Smith, J. H., Gawain's Leap: G. G. K. l. 2316..... 462
—, The Education of —: Illus- trated from the Schoolbooks in Use in his Time..... 555	Snyder, F. B., The Life of Robert Burns ..... 127
<i>Shakespeare-Jahrbuch</i> ..... 549	Social Criticism of Fenimore Cooper, The — ..... 422
Shakespearean Criticism, A His- tory of — ..... 548	Solomon, Chaucer's <i>Merchant's Tale</i> and a Russian Legend of King — ..... 229
<i>Shamefastnesse</i> , Spenser's —, <i>Faerie Queene</i> , II, ix, 40-44.. 387	Sommerfeld, M., Judith Dramen des 16.-17. Jahrhunderts, nebst Luthers Vorrede zum Buch Judith ..... 558
Shanks, Elsie, Anglo-Norman <i>Suite 'Work(?)'</i> ..... 239	Songs of John Dryden, The — (ed. C. L. Day)..... 350
Shanks, L. P.: J. Pommier, La Mystique de Baudelaire.... 65	Sonnets, Some Eighteenth-Cen- tury — ..... 507
Sharp, R. L., The Pejorative Use of <i>Metaphysical</i> ..... 503	Source for <i>Cambises</i> , A ..... 384
Shepard, W. P.: A. Pillet and H. Carstens, Bibliographie der Troubadours..... 408	— of the "Lonesome Road" Stanza in <i>The Ancient Mar- iner</i> , Another ..... 111
<i>Shepherds' Calendar</i> , An Allu- sion to Bromley in the — — 443	—s of the <i>Court of Sapience</i> , The ..... 275
Sheridan, The Comedy of Man- ners from — to Maugham... 120	Soziale Lyrik in England 1880- 1914 ..... 66
Shifting of Responsibility in XVIIIth Century French Tragic Drama, The —..... 152	Spanish Review Grammar, A Graded — — — with Compo- sition ..... 64
Shorthand Letters of Samuel Pepys (ed. E. Chappell).... 278	Spencer, B. T. (ed.), <i>The Bond- man: An Antient Storie</i> . By Philip Massinger..... 118
Should there be any Plurals in <i>oes</i> ? ..... 95	Spencer, H.: A. Ralli, A His- tory of Shakespearean Criti- cism ..... 548
Shove, F., Christina Rossetti, a Study ..... 68	—: B. Perry, Emerson Today 345
Sibbald, The <i>Memoirs</i> of Sir Robert — (ed. F. P. Hett).. 134	— (ed.), Elizabethan Plays, written by Shakespeare's
Sibley, Gertrude M., The Lost Plays and Masques 1500-1642 552	
Sidney, Tremellius, —, and Biblical Verse..... 145	

# INDEX

581

PAGE	PAGE
Friends, Colleagues, Rivals, and Successors..... 50	Sulger-Gebing, E. and W. Lin- den, Gerhart Hauptmann... 65
—: F. E. Budd (ed.), <i>The</i> <i>Works of William Burnaby</i> . 343	<i>swa</i> , The Use of — in Old English ..... 537
—: G. A. Plimpton, <i>The Edu-</i> <i>cation of Shakespeare: Illus-</i> <i>trated from the Schoolbooks</i> <i>in Use in his Time</i> ..... 555	Symbolism, The Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mytho- logical —..... 544
—: J. C. Ghosh (ed.), <i>The</i> <i>Works of Thomas Otway:</i> <i>Plays, Poems, and Love-</i> <i>Letters</i> ..... 351	<i>Syntax</i> , An Omission from Curme's —..... 404
—: L. Abercrombie and others, <i>Aspects of Shakespeare: Be-</i> <i>ing British Academy Lectures</i> — (ed.), <i>The Tragedy of King</i> <i>Richard III</i> ..... 546	<i>Syntax</i> , Handbuch der erklär- enden —..... 267
Spenser, Emerson's Adaptation of a Line from —..... 265	Tarr, F. C. and A. Centeno, A Graded Spanish Review Gram- mar with Composition..... 64
—, <i>Faerie Queene</i> ..... 391	Tasso, Guez de Balzac and —. 320
— Parallel, A —..... 393	Tate, The Date of Nahum —'s Death ..... 169
—, Ronsard, and Bion..... 139	Telfer, R. S. (ed.), Massinger, <i>The Unnatural Combat</i> ..... 553
—, <i>Shepherd's Calendar</i> ..... 443	Tennyson, <i>Maud</i> ..... 290
—'s <i>Shamefastnesse, Faerie</i> <i>Queene</i> , II, ix, 40-44..... 387	<i>tester: Knight's Tale</i> , 2499... 397
Spiller, R. E.: J. E. Ross, <i>The</i> <i>Social Criticism of Fenimore</i> <i>Cooper</i> ..... 422	Thackeray, W. M. —: <i>L'homme</i> , <i>le penseur, le romancier</i> ..... 200
Squire and the Number of the Canterbury Pilgrims, The — 216	Théâtre français, <i>L'Histoire de</i> <i>la mise en scène dans le —</i> <i>de 1600 à 1657</i> ..... 539
Steele, <i>The Christian Hero</i> (ed. Rae Blanchard)..... 342	Théophile de Viau: <i>Pyrame et</i> <i>Thisbé</i> (ed. J. Hankiss)..... 63
Stein, H., Goldsmith's Transla- tion of the <i>Roman comique</i> .. 171	Thirteenth Century <i>Oure Fader</i> in a Pavia MS., A —..... 235
Steiner, A., The Date of Com- position of <i>Ciperis de Vigne-</i> <i>vauw</i> ..... 559	Thomson, S. H., A XIIIth Cen- tury <i>Oure Fader</i> in a Pavia MS. .... 235
Stewart, R. (ed.), <i>The Ameri-</i> <i>can Notebooks of Nathaniel</i> <i>Hawthorne</i> ..... 130	Thorpe, C. D., Thomas Hamner and the Anonymous Essay on <i>Hamlet</i> ..... 493
<i>stir and chive</i> ..... 98	Thunor in Kent..... 238
Stochholm, Johanne M. (ed.), Massinger, <i>The Great Duke of</i> <i>Florence</i> ..... 553	Tinker, E. L., Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana... 190
Stoll, E. E., <i>The Beau Monde at</i> <i>the Restoration</i> ..... 425	—: J. K. Ditchy (ed.), <i>Les</i> <i>Acadiens louisianais et leur</i> <i>parler</i> ..... 188
Storm, <i>Immensee</i> ..... 34	—, <i>Les Ecrits de langue fran-</i> <i>çaise en Louisiane au XIXe</i> <i>siècle</i> ..... 190
Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal..... 339	—, <i>The Palingenesis of Craps</i> 190
Strathmann, E. A.: Leota S. Willis, Francis Lenton, Queen's Poet..... 135	Tirso's <i>Santa Juana, Primera</i> <i>Parte</i> ..... 13
Student's Milton, The — (ed. F. A. Patterson)..... 558	To an <i>Albumblatt</i> of Uhland... 301, 562
<i>suite</i> , Anglo-Norman — ' <i>Work</i> (?)' ..... 239	Todd-Naylor, Ursula (ed.), <i>The</i> <i>Country Wife</i> . By William Wycherley ..... 118
	<i>Torquato Tasso</i> , <i>Der dramatische</i> <i>Vortrieb in Goethes —</i> ..... 558

	PAGE		PAGE
Torrey, N. L.: Ruth Clark, Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal.....	339	Vega, Lope de — and the Duque de Osuna.....	1
Towles, O. et Ch.-M. des Granges, Histoire de la civilisation française des origines à nos jours .....	351	—, Lope de —'s <i>Peregrino</i> Lists not <i>Termini a Quo</i> ....	11
Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England, The .....	274	<i>Vengement Alixandre</i> , An Un- published Fragment of Gui de Cambrai's .....	366
Tragédie religieuse, L'Évolution de la — classique en France	539	Vercelli Book, The — (ed. G. P. Krapp).....	352
<i>Tragedy of King Richard III</i> , The — (ed. H. Spencer)....	546	— -Homilien, Die — (ed. M. Förster) .....	352
Tragic Relief.....	489	Vigny, Alfred de —, Contribu- tion à sa biographie intellec- tuelle .....	421
Trahard, P., Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle (1715-1789). Tome III	268	Vinant, G., Malwida de Meysen- bug, sa vie et ses amis.....	492
Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole <i>Incendium Amoris</i> und <i>Emendatio Vitae</i> und deren Übersetzung durch Rich- ard Misyn, Die .....	272	Vogt, Frieda, Thomas Hardys Naturansicht in seinen Ro- manen .....	202
Tremellius, Sidney, and Bibli- cal Verse.....	145	Vogt, F. and M. Koch, Ge- schichte der deutschen Litera- tur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart.....	338
Troubadours, Bibliographie der — .....	408	Voltaire and Blin de Sainmore: An Unpublished — Letter..	470
Uhland, To an <i>Albumblatt</i> of — .....	301, 562	—, Two Unpublished Letters of — .....	181
Undiscovered Bit of Verse by Longfellow, An .....	311, 423	Von deutscher Dichtung und Musik .....	60
University of Michigan, Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature. By Members of the English De- partment of the — .....	51	Wade, G. E., Tirso's <i>Santa</i> <i>Juana, Primera Parte</i> .....	13
<i>Unnatural Combat, The</i> — (ed. R. S. Telfer).....	553	Wagner, Nachklänge Richard —s im Roman.....	67
Un-Noticed Acrostic and an Inglorious Poet, An .....	457	—, Richard — in der fran- zösischen Literatur; 2. Teil: die Prosa.....	67
Unpublished Anecdotes by Fern- nán Caballero Preserved by Washington Irving, Two —.	25	Walraf, Eva, Soziale Lyrik in England 1880-1914.....	66
— Fragment of Gui de Cam- brai's <i>Vengement Alixandre</i> , An — .....	366	Wandel des deutschen Natur- gefühls vom 15. zum 18. Jahr- hundert, Der .....	58
— Letter of Du Bartas, An — .....	150	Ward, H., Should there be any Plurals in <i>oes</i> ?.....	95
— Letters of Voltaire, Two — .....	181	Ware, R. H., American Adapta- tions of French Plays on the New York and Philadelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War .....	120
Urfé, Etude sur les <i>Epistres</i> <i>morales d'Honoré d'</i> .....	421	Watson, E. B.: M. S. Peterson, Robert Jephson (1736-1803): A Study of His Life and Works .....	120
Use of <i>Swa</i> in Old English, The — .....	537	—: N. W. Sawyer, The Com- edy of Manners from Sheridan to Maugham.....	120
Valentine and Orson.....	68	—: R. H. Ware, American Adaptations of French Plays on the New York and Phil-	
Van Wijngaarden, N., Les Odyss- ées philosophiques en France entre 1616 et 1789.....	413		



	PAGE
adelphia Stages from 1834 to the Civil War.....	120
Weber, A., George Gissing und die soziale Frage.....	200
Weber, C. J.: R. Stewart (ed.), The American Notebooks of Nathaniel Hawthorne.....	130
Weigand, H. J., Thomas Mann's Novel <i>Der Zauberberg</i> .....	419
Wells, J. E., Fifth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English.....	138
Werner, Dorothy L., The Idea of Union in American Verse (1776-1876) .....	349
Whiting, B. J.: E. Schnell, Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole <i>Incendium Amoris</i> und <i>Emendatio Vitae</i> und deren Übersetzung durch Richard Misyn.....	272
Whiting, G. W., Milton's Rules for -ed.....	166
Who Was "The Late Arrian"? .....	500
Wilkens, F. H.: W. Havers, Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax .....	267
Will, S. F., An Unpublished Letter of Du Bartas.....	150
Williams, R. B., An Omission from Curme's <i>Syntax</i> .....	404
Williams, S. T. and E. H. Hespelt, Two Unpublished Anecdotes by Fernán Caballero Preserved by Washington Irving .....	25
Willinsky, Margarete, Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes... ..	116
Willis, Leota S., Francis Lenton, Queen's Poet.....	135
Wilmothte, B. M. Woodbridge, Le Roman belge contemporain. Préface de M. —.....	542
Wise, T. J. and T. L. Hood (eds.), Letters of Robert Browning .....	552
Wollebius, Milton, Ibn Ezra, and — .....	506
Woodbridge, B. M.: J. Sellards, Dans le Sillage du romantisme. Charles Didier (1805-1864). .....	195
—, B. M., Le Roman belge Contemporain. Préface de M. Wilmothte .....	542
Wordsworth, Die Bedeutung —	

	PAGE
scher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats .....	488
—, Literary Friendships in the Age of — (ed. R. C. Bald) .....	137
—, <i>The Borderers</i> .....	104
—, <i>The Prelude</i> .....	559
work, Anglo-Norman <i>Suite</i> '— (?)' .....	239
Works of Thomas Otway: Plays, Poems, and Love-Letters, The — (ed. J. C. Ghosh).....	351
— of William Burnaby, The — (ed. F. E. Budd).....	343
Wright, Elizabeth M., The Life of Joseph Wright.....	346
Wright, L. O., Final <i>S Plus N-Glide</i> in Mexico.....	18
Wright, Luella M., Literature and Education in Early Quakerism .....	55
—, The Literary Life of the Early Friends, 1650-1725. With an Introduction by R. M. Jones.....	55
Wyatt's Letters to his Son....	446
Wycherley, <i>The Country Wife</i> (ed. Ursula Todd-Naylor)... ..	118
Young, K., The Drama of the Medieval Church.....	112
Zauberberg, Thomas Mann's Novel <i>Der</i> —.....	419
Zdanowicz, C. D.: Marion F. Chevalier, A Dramatic Adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century: <i>Les Aventures et le Mariage de Pamurge</i> (1674) by Pousset de Montauban, with a Study of His Life and Other Plays....	483
Zucker, A. E.: Anna Jacobson, Nachklänge Richard Wagners in Roman.....	67
—: G. Vinant, Malwida de Meysenbug, sa vie et ses amis .....	492
—: H. Ammon, Dämon Faust .....	66
—: H. J. Weigand, Thomas Mann's Novel <i>Der Zauberberg</i> .....	419
—: J. Boyd, Goethe's Knowledge of English Literature.. ..	67
—: K. Jäckel, Richard Wagner in der französischen Literatur; 2. Teil: die Prosa....	67
—: M. O. Zwick, Berthold	

	PAGE		PAGE
Auerbachs sozialpolitischer und ethischer Liberalismus..	492	Vortrieb in Goethes <i>Torquato</i> <i>Tasso</i> .....	558
—: M. Sommerfeld (ed.), Judith Dramen des 16.-17. Jahrhunderts, nebst Luthers Vorrede zum Buch Judith...	558	— and P. de F. Henderson, <i>Camille</i> as the Translation of <i>La Dame aux Camélias</i> .....	472
—: P. Engel, Der dramatische		Zwick, M. O., Berthold Auer- bachs sozialpolitischer und ethischer Liberalismus .....	492